DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 210 HE 013 318

AUTHOR	Kaylor, Paul E., Ed.
TITLE	The Early College in Theory and Practice.
INSTITUTION	Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.: Simon's Rock Early Coll., Great Barrington, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	94p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Simon's Rock Early College, Great Barrington, MA 01230
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adolescent Development: Age Differences: *Articulation (Education): College Planning: *College School Cooperation: College Students: *Early Admission: Emotional Development: *Experimental Colleges: Experimental Programs: Experimental Schools: Higher Education: Intellectual Development: Nontraditional Education: Program Evaluation: Self Concept: *Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS	*Simons Rock Early College MA

ABSTRACT

Papers from a 1977 meeting on the early college in theory and practice are presented. The purpose of the meeting or consultation was (1) to assess the first 11 years of Simon's Rock Early College, the only college in America specifically designed for students in the 16- to 20-year-old age group and (2) to raise questions about the relationship of the early college concept to the growing number of institutions that have early admission options for younger students. Papers are as follows: the keynote address by Elizabeth B. Hall: "Excellence and Equality: An Issue in Policy and Concept," by Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr.: "Emotional Development and Identity Formation in Adolescence," by Joseph Katz: "Adolescence and the Social System," by Edward A. Wynne: "The Early College: Educational Strategies for Growth into Freedom," by Frederick P. Ferre: "Breaking the Educational Lockstep: The Simon's Rock Experience," by Nancy R. Goldberger: and "Who Should Enter College Early?" by Samuel H. Magill. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Alumni Foundation
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RECEIVED
AUG
8-16-78

HE

74-15036

ED195210

KE 013 318

THE EARLY COLLEGE

IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Edited by Paul E. Kaylor

©Copyright 1978

Simon's Rock Early College
Great Barrington, MA 01230

PREFACE

In October, 1977, Simon's Rock Early College and the Association of American Colleges jointly sponsored a 'Consultation of the Early College in Theory and Practice'. The purpose of the consultation was to assess the first eleven years of the only college in America specifically designed for students in the 16 to 20 year old age group and to raise questions about the relationship of the early college concept to the growing number of institutions that have early admission options for younger students.

Simon's Rock Early College was founded by Elizabeth B. Hall, former headmistress of Concord Academy, on the evidence that many young people were motivated and academically ready for college after completion of the tenth or eleventh grade. This challenged the assumption that orderly progression through twelve years of primary and secondary school was necessary for college bound students. On the surface this seemed to be in keeping with the thinking of other educators who advocated early admission to conventional colleges and universities for a selected few. But it was different in that Mrs. Hall proposed a new type of institution in which the needs of younger students would be addressed in a self-consciously supportive environment not found in the conventional college or university. Because of differences she perceived in the emotional and social development of older students and the 16 to 20 year old age group, Mrs. Hall was convinced that the demand was not simply for early admission options at traditional institutions, but for colleges designed for them. She proposed Simon's Rock as a model for change in the structure of the American educational system.

The College was incorporated in 1964 and the new campus in Great Barrington, Massachusetts was ready for students in 1966. After the predictable struggles with the educational establishment, Simon's Rock was accredited and authorized to grant degrees. The first Associate in Arts degrees were granted in 1970 and the first Bachelor of Arts degrees in 1976. Students who have received the Associate in Arts degree or who have transferred to traditional institutions have been given full credit for their work at Simon's Rock. Graduates with the Bachelor of Arts degree are enrolled in graduate programs at leading colleges and universities or have entered the work force two years ahead of their peers.

After more than a decade the concept of the early college embodied in Simon's Rock has been proven. However, questions still remain. Not the least of these is the viability of new institutions at a time when traditional colleges and universities are experiencing severe economic pressures. Admitting the need for a fresh look at the rigidity of the conventional school-college sequence, it has been suggested that expanded early admission options at established institutions is a more feasible way to meet the needs of those who want to enter college at age 16 or 17. The Simon's Rock response to that suggestion has been negative, but the evidence from institutions with such options is not yet sufficient to determine an adequate answer.

For this reason this issue was not addressed at the Consultation. However, it was recognized that the economic question must be resolved if the early college concept is to extend beyond Simon's Rock.

The issues which were addressed concerned emotional development and identity formation, intellectual development, the adolescent and the social system, the early college concept, and educational strategies in an early college. This volume grew out of the addresses and discussions at the Consultation. The essays by Elizabeth B. Hall, Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr., Joseph Katz, Edward A. Wynne, and Frederick P. Ferré are edited versions of addresses; the paper by Nancy R. Goldberger was prepared as background material for discussion; and the essay by Samuel H. Magill reflects some of his concerns about that segment of the student population for whom an early college is appropriate. The Magill article was written after the Consultation.

It should be noted that this volume does not contain a contribution by one of the major speakers. William Perry, Jr., Director of the Harvard University Bureau of Study Counsel, delivered an informal address on his work and responded to many questions from the floor. We have not attempted to duplicate his presentation due to transmission difficulties. However, it was widely recognized that his longitudinal studies of forms of intellectual and ethical development of college students have important implications for teaching and curriculum planning in an early college setting. A full description of his theory and research at Harvard can be found in his book, **Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development**, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., New York, 1970.

In expressing appreciation for assistance in a project such as this one there is always the danger of omitting the names of those to whom gratitude is due. However, I must take the risk of making special acknowledgement to the Consultation Planning Committee: Robert W. Corrigan, Nancy R. Goldberger, Gail B. Hall, Brian Hopewell, John T. McLoughlin, David M. Leverenz, Catherine B. Miller, and Samuel H. Magill. Appreciation must also be expressed to those who gave addresses and led discussions: Elizabeth B. Hall, Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr., Joseph Katz, William Perry, Jr., Edward A. Wynne, Frederick P. Ferré, and Carol Gilligin. And Grace Wildes, secretary in the office of Institutional Resources, has our appreciation for her invaluable assistance with both Consultation arrrangements and the preparation of this publication.

Finally, it should be noted that the Consultation in October, 1977, and this publication were made possible by a grant from the National Science Foundation.

Paul Evans Kaylor, Coordinator,
Consultation on the Early College

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	iii
THE KEYNOTE ADDRESS Elizabeth B. Hall	7
EXCELLENCE AND EQUALITY: AN ISSUE IN POLICY AND CONCEPT Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr.	12
EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND IDENTITY FORMATION IN ADOLESCENCE Joseph Katz	27
ADOLESCENCE AND THE SOCIAL SYSTEM Edward A. Wynne	37
THE EARLY COLLEGE: EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR GROWTH INTO FREEDOM Frederick P. Ferré	50
BREAKING THE EDUCATIONAL LOCKSTEP: THE SIMON'S ROCK EXPERIENCE Nancy R. Goldberger	62
WHO SHOULD ENTER COLLEGE EARLY? Samuel H. Magill	88
Contributors	94

A KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Elizabeth B. Hall

I intend to talk today about the Simon's Rock I dreamed of, and still dream of. I do not intend to talk about the Simon's Rock that has evolved to date. Nor do I intend to talk about the Simon's Rock that is defined by some as an alternative to the traditional, an anomaly called 'early college', thought to be trying to provide **traditional** college to young people two years ahead of the traditional time. In other words, a Simon's Rock which is trying to be a traditional college but admitting students two years early. And, incidentally, that term 'early college' has probably done as much to keep people from understanding what we are really about as anything else along a twelve year journey beset with obstacles.

So what **is** Simon's Rock supposed to be? What did I dream of?

I dreamed of a college **FOR** sixteen year-olds, designed to meet their needs whether mature or immature, and designed to continue meeting the needs of those sixteen year-olds as they turned into seventeen, eighteen, nineteen and twenty year-olds.

But, before I expand on that let me sketch the steps by which I came to my conclusions that Simon's Rock should be that kind of college. The roots of my dream go back, I suppose, to my own adolescence, a period I wouldn't want to go through again, the worst of my life. The rebellion was born then, **and** the idealism.

First was the rebellion that made me than and there, and thereafter, want to three years of my adolescence, the years when I was sixteen, seventeen, and eighteen, in a residential prep school. It was the fashion in those days to correct young people in a residential prep school. It was the fashion in those days to correct young people for wrong doing by exposing them to ridicule. Thus I was paraded in front of the entire school for what seemed to me like endless miles with a book balanced on my head. The objective was commendable enough: to correct poor posture. But resentment stirred within me. Similarly, I was made to recite a poem in front of everyone in what I regarded as an 'air-conditioned' and totally affected voice: 'The gardener's cat's called Mignonette. She hates the cold. She hates the wet. She sits among the hot house flowers and sleeps for hours and hours and hours.' Again the object was commendable: to overcome what was regarded as the masculine quality of my speaking voice, a quality developed as a means to making my very deaf mother hear me. To this day telephone operators say 'yes, Sir,' to me.

But along with the rebellion there was instilled in me a sense of what it really means to be civilized. In those three years I was taught and I learned that there can be no productive joint effort at all, and certainly not the joint effort that could bring about peace on earth and goodwill toward men, unless each of us, as individuals, can learn to control the urge to personal gratification, and, in particular, instant personal gratification. To be able to forego what I want right this minute for the sake of achieving later on that which is not only good for me but good for others as well: to me this ability is the measure of my social maturity, my claim to be civilized.

I also learned the enormous importance of manners as a means to achieving and maintaining a civilized state. Instead of seeing manners as meaningless formalities, **or** despicable hypocrisies, forced upon me by a mother, probably a fraud herself, who wanted me to be thought well of for her own sake, not mine, I came to understand good manners as enabling us to keep the way open for the formation of those relationships between people that can work for the good of all.

So **there** were the roots of my dream in the years of my own adolescence. But the steps go on from there, all different but all involved with this period of turmoil, uncertainty, and distress called adolescence through which we all must pass. First, there were the adolescent years of our own four children, two daughters and two sons. Then there were fifteen years of other people's adolescent children, and **not** counting the six years at Simon's Rock. That is a lot of adolescent children!

It was through these years, as parent, teacher and school head, that I went through the period of expanding college facilities, an expansion prompted by post-war affluence that could act on the firm American belief that more education for a rapidly growing youth population was A Good Thing. These were the years when I saw the role of the College President change from that of a person chosen for the ability to help young people to become civilized to a person chosen for the ability to raise money. These were the years when I saw the faculty members who were famous and long remembered for their enormous part in the civilizing process, as well as for their scholarship, replaced by scholars too busy with the demands of research to bother with the civilizing of students. These were the years when I saw the vacancies created by the departure of these Civilizers filled with specialists called Counsellors whose clinical approach at best was problem oriented, and at worst made students look like patients.

These were the years, the nineteen-fifties, when getting into the college of one's choice was regarded as the rich reward for all one's efforts in school. They were also the years of mounting anger and disappointment on the part of those who did get in at the institutional impersonality which they were now encountering in college. These were the years when both curriculum and tests became standardized in the schools as the college preparatory system moved to adopt mass production methods in the face of unprecedented numbers seeking admission to college. This, coming concurrently with the development of institutional impersonality at first the college level and then the public high school, added to the student's feeling that identity was lost. These were the years when the apalling consequences of standardization brought a resurgence of interest in the means to take account of differences. On the one hand we were concerned with learning difficulties, particularly reading disability. And on the other hand we had a keen interest in the gifted, and we were horrified by the possibility that the gifts might be stultified by being held to a rigid standard.

So we had the Three School-Three College experiments whereby we experimented with moving students out of school and into college ahead of schedule. But sixteen-year olds did not fit into a freshman class of eighteen year olds. And no more did high school seniors of seventeen and eighteen fit into the age groups **they** found, nor the curriculum requirements, when they were moved ahead after high school into

Sophomore or Junior year. The Advanced Placement Program, where one moved ahead in subject, but not in class, seemed to promise better, and we adopted it.

But the Advanced Placement Program did not do it either. In the high school the Advanced Placement Classes that prepared the gifted for the Advanced Placement Exams tended strongly to develop a kind of intellectual elitism. In my experience students with AP ratings were dangerously close to, if not at the point, where they considered themselves **better** people. Scholastic ability was equated with virtue!

John Gardener, late of Common Cause, spoke out at this time with his little book called **Excellence**. At the time he was Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. From that position he surveyed clear-eyed the distressing scene in education and launched in his book an attack on the standardization of education without regard for the plurality of talents that exists and is needed in society. He further attacked most vigorously the hierarchy of prestige which we attach to the various skills once talents are developed. Said he, in effect, 'If it is considered more worthy to be a philosopher than a plumber, then all will try to become philosophers, and neither our philosophic theories nor our pipes will hold water.'

Meanwhile, that doughty anthropologist, Blackberry Winter, Margaret Mead, expert on growing up, whether it be coming of age in Samoa or in the United States, had her piece to say. And her attack was directed at the increasingly uncivilized character of both the college and the high school. Institutional impersonality, at first decried by matriculating students, had been translated into a way of life. 'If you can't lick it, join it'. Furthermore, proof of a rotten world lay in the facts of heroes assassinated, racial inequality, the Vietnam War, and a perfidious Nixon, by his perfidy, totally discrediting in the eyes of the young, a civilized mode of living by presuming to preach its virtues and aspects. Indifferent students met indifferent teachers and went their separate ways proclaiming now that institutional impersonality was protection for sacred privacy and privacy was not to be invaded for any reason, not even the welfare of the individual or of society. To this situation spoke Margaret Mead, as usual mincing no words. Nurture was the word she used. Without nurture of our young, she declared, plus active concern for each other, we could not be a society, let alone civilized. Who heeded her then? Not many, I fear. But I did.

Having delivered herself of this blast, Margaret Mead then went on to state that in addition to abdicating our responsibility for nurturing the young, our high schools and colleges were no longer meeting the needs of the adolescent in other ways because the adolescent of today was markedly different. Those coming of age today, she argued, excepting the socially and physically handicapped, possess physical and intellectual powers greater than those their age in previous generations. Advances in medicine, better nutrition, and generally better child care have provided optimum conditions for physical development. Concurrently, and for the same reasons, their intellectual capacity has increased. They can absorb more information and retain it longer. Then she went on to say that the rate, however, at which these young adults achieve social and emotional maturity remains the same. In consequence, a dangerous imbalance results. The power of execution possessed by the young adult

today is greater than his capacity for sound judgement and effective action as a member of society.

That did it for me. I had seen it myself. So soon strong. So late civilized. The idea for Simon's Rock had already been formed. My blueprint, the paper called **The House of Education Needs Overhaul**, had already been written in 1965. And the idea had been embodied in the actuality of Simon's Rock which opened in 1966. But I had been fumbling, playing by ear, launching my positives from the negatives I knew I did not want Simon's Rock to embody. Now here was Margaret Mead giving me the authoritative rationale for what my experience and observations had told me should be done.

Simon's Rock was to be a college **FOR** sixteen year-olds, whether mature or not. It was to be a college that would meet adolescents aged sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, and twenty where they were at. And it would protect their dignity. It was to be a college that would provide adolescents with a breadth of curriculum in line with the breadth of their intellectual interest and abilities. Thus we would nurture the plurality of intellectual talents that might be present in our student population. Thirdly, Simon's Rock was to be a college that would teach as traditional United States colleges cannot teach because of their preoccupation with research and their current regard for institutional impersonality. Simon's Rock would count the students her first responsibility and would count the teaching ability of her faculty of first importance, along with their scholarship. Fourthly, Simon's Rock was to be a college that would not hide from its students by assuming institutional impersonality on the grounds that it was doing so out of respect for their privacy. Rather, Simon's Rock would dare to teach them, by every means possible, **including that of example**, how to be civilized. And, finally, Simon's Rock would reveal the outworn usefulness of our traditional high schools and colleges by providing a model for reform.

I did not, in short, see Simon's Rock as an alternative for the mature few but as a means to serving better an age group that is not now being served as it should be by our high schools and colleges. I saw Simon's Rock as the college of the future, **not** 'early college.'

Just suppose this caught on! What would be the implications for our institutions as they are, the high school, the community college, the undergraduate college, the graduate school, and the labor market? Time forbids my expanding here on this, another whole speech in itself. But here are my thoughts in brief. I would have the high school, begin with the seventh grade and last through tenth. Junior High School, so called, has for long been neither hay nor grass. Ages twelve and thirteen for whom adolescence is just dawning, go well with ages fourteen and fifteen who have not yet got the sun up either. The Community College could burgeon from being a two-year program into a fully fledged four-year college, like Simon's Rock in its commitments, but specially suited to an even greater range of abilities than a residential college can accommodate, and specially suited to the needs of those students who either do not wish to or cannot afford to go away to a residential college.

The undergraduate college could heave a sigh of relief and drop off those freshmen and sophomores whom they do not know how to teach properly anyway. It could then turn to what it does know well, scholarship and research. The junior and senior years of the present undergraduate college could become part of graduate school, where they belong.

And what of these new young college graduates aged nineteen and twenty? Would they be an unwelcome flood upon the labor market? No more so than now because, in our highly complicated technology, industry itself is doing more and more what the engineering and business schools used to do. 'In house' training is becoming the order of the day for college graduates. And, besides, with the system loosening up to let students take anything from a term to a year or more away, who knows if all our college graduates would be only nineteen or twenty?

So this is what I had in mind. I have told you what I dreamed of and what I still dream of. Many will say it is an impossible dream. I can only reply that work towards an approximation of the model I want Simon's Rock to be will always be an enriching experience and may be rewarding ultimately in as yet unforseen ways. On the other hand, to work towards making Simon's Rock merely an alternative to an outworn system is to ensure its future as a totally undistinguished institution perceived for the most part as an alternative for odd-balls and misfits. I shall not mind if a host of new institutions modelled on Simon's Rock does not rise up. God knows, I know it's hard to start a new institution! I ask only that the thrust be changed and that America's existing educational institutions move to meet our young adults where they are, half child half grown up, but grown up too soon for the present ordering of our schools and colleges to meet their needs.

11

EXCELLENCE AND EQUALITY: AN ISSUE IN POLICY AND CONCEPT

Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr.

The idea of an Early College commands high admiration for its boldness, its ambition, and its steady-eyed, unromantic confronting of both social needs and human limitations For the Early College accepts not one misssion as the heart of its educational business but two: On the one hand, focusing on the stormy developmental stage known as late adolescence, it willingly undertakes the responsibility for socialization---for facilitating the moral and psychological as well as the cognitive and academic growth of people moving through complex and crucial phases of their lifecycles. On the other hand, it simultaneously concerns itself with that intellectually liberalizing process of transmitting, through the exhibited devices of critical thought, a winnowed cultural tradition.

The order is a tall one, and the attempt to fill it comes at an unpropitious historical season. In general, American adults currently suffer from significant insecurities about the appropriate and most desirable directions and dimensions of development for their children; and the anxieties of parents reverberate, not always harmonically, in the confusions, doubts, defensive surliness, and low levels of trust so evident in large numbers of their offspring. If the last quarter of the twentieth century generates an uncommon share of excitement, it provides little surety about what kinds of people will most likely succeed and find happiness (Indeed, what is success? What is happiness?) in the unshaped and only dimly imagined society of the future---assuming, of course, that there is a future.

Ambiguities and their correlated anxieties about personal development and the unrevealed contours of tomorrow's civilization attach themselves to our faith in liberal education and even our comprehension of it. In an age dominated by television and pictorial communication, how important are the skills of reading and writing? When the academic disciplines have become exacting and self-contained professional specialties, what is their contribution to the liberalizing development of the person, the citizen, the breeder of a new generation? In their economic roles, today's adolescents will rarely find direct advantage in familiarity with pi-mesons, an understanding of 'In Memoriam,' or an acquaintance with the antecedents of the bloodless revolution of 1688. Perhaps most of all, given our elevated consciousness of the ethnic and racial diversity of our population, how sure are we that the traditions of western Europe, no matter how carefully analyzed and subjected to a humanely critical appraisal, define the proper basis for the education of people who find their spiritual forebearers in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, and Latin America?

Here we have it. When it tackles its twin problems of furthering the civilizing growth of late adolescents and providing a liberalizing intellectual experience, the Early College---as idea and as institution---encounters one of our age's most distressing issues, the clash between the ideals of equality and of excellence. The incompatibility of desirable and even essential objectives is, of course, an ancient component of humankind's experience.[1] Yet every period seems destined to feel its

own shocks of anguish as it discovers the ways in which this kind of tension manifests itself. In our era, one of our most painful and disruptive struggles, both in our souls and in our institutions, centers on the perceived opposition between standards of quality and that achievement of social parity among all citizens that the Declaration of Independence so nobly promised.

One of the major outgrowths of that struggle in higher education has been the concept of open admissions at a number of our colleges and universities. Nowhere has that concept been applied with such sweep nor its applications examined under a brighter light than in the City University of New York, especially at City College. As Dean Theodore L. Gross[2] recounts the experience, it began in demands from minorities, especially black and Puerto Rican, that

> seemed ideologically sound and in the best tradition of liberalism: A public institution of higher learning should educate all the citizenry. What group of self-pronounced liberals could refuse that opportunity? (We faculty members were whites whose parents had been Irish or Italian or Jewish immigrants out of one ghetto or another... we felt a vague sympathy for open admissions...

But when , under the passionate pressures of 1970, the policy of open admissions was adopted,

> The impact was particularly severe at the City College of New York, where academic achievement had been like a code of honor that never included considerations of class, race, religion, or national origin. The City College had been the great tuition-free institution whose diploma had had so special a meaning for alumni---the hard-earned diploma of the poor. The alumni had been proud that they had been admitted to the proletarian Harvard...proud that they had been graduated...nostalgic about their youthful poverty and grateful to have escaped it through the college; strong-minded about their remembered hunger for learning and eager to preserve the meaning of their academic achievement.
>
> Some of them were bitterly disaffected...and renounced their alma mater because they believed it had betrayed the standards they had struggled to achieve. But most were bewildered by this new generation of students for whom the college had to 'soften' those standards. [They] distrusted the arguments about deprivation---hadn't they themselves been deprived?---but they sensed that the quality of this current deprivation was different, linked to a racist society that they had disavowed;-and even if it wasn't different, they could afford to be generous...they wished to be tolerant and understanding...

As for the faculty, on whom the burden of implementing open admissions fell, (we strained so hard to be successful that we didn't have the time to call into question the expectations imposed upon us by minorities and, more important by ourselves...we had false expectations). Open admissions students came with a sense of fear and self-doubt, confronting a standard language that was rendered even more complicated by their need to master at the same time and in the same place, the separate language of biology or psychology. Their entire miseducation and bookless past rose to haunt them, and all the audiovisual aids and writing laboratories and simplified curricular materials we tried could not turn the trick.

The results, in Dean Gross's moving evaluation, are summarized in a poignant sentence: 'We were preparing our students to be the parents of college students, not to be students themselves.' Probably a fundamental literacy was being achieved, itself a consummation devoutly to be wished. But little could be claimed for an education that entails a sense of the past upon which a concept of the future rests, that provides the knowledge which, when colored by vision, defines the basis of wisdom, that confers the critical skills that permit the discrimination of the moral from the immoral, the transient and faddish from the permanent and genuine, that furnishes the confidence in self that comes from winning a rich understanding of something complex and generalizable. The heartbreak in Dean Gross's account lies in a kind of double default: If standards of excellence were not successfully extended to those who previously had enjoyed little access to the benefits of meeting them, neither was the principle of equality dramatically advanced. The nominal exposure of the historically excluded to a drastically modified institutional atmosphere hardly represents the parity of all persons of which the Declaration spoke.

This case study of a humanely vigourous but unsuccessful effort seems as noteworthy for two issues that it does not discuss as for the issues that it sets out with such insightful and courageous candor. The first is its incorporation of the widely held and rarely articulated assumption that the traditional academic institution plays a central and critical role in the achievement of our most fundamental national goals. This peculiar significance seems to hold both for those to whom the college or university stands as watchdog over our intellectual and professional standards and for those to whom they provided the focus for a new generous stirring and mixing of cultural elements in the population. Most of us in an unexamined fashion functionally believe that the process of teaching and learning are virtually the exclusive properties of the academy and that there are no alternatives to colleges and universities either for the maintenance and enhancement of quality or for the promotion of important intercultural interactions. Something of this sort lies at the root of the notion that a denial of academic access amounts indeed to a denial of equality as an ideal and as a long-standing societal aspiration. This profoundly implicit point of view represents only a variant, although a desperately crucial one, on that old American tendency to look to the schools as an agency of reform, to expect 'education' to solve problems ranging from the influx of immigrants to protection against communism to the achievement of integration. It may be time to question whether schools, from kindergartens through PhD programs, can effectively carry such burdens.

Second, only tangentially does Dean Gross touch on the relationship of higher education to a political system that aspires toward democracy. The issue of racism has high relevance here, of course; but there is at least no explicit attention paid to the quality of the vote as one of the foundation stones of a polity deriving from the documents that define the American dream. No one would dissent---Dean Gross least of all---from the social necessity of continuously educating the voter---the voter as devotee of civil right and civil liberties, the voter as one who understands and cares about issues of high complexity, and the voter as informed and astute judge of

the intelligence, the compassion, and the vision of candidates for leadership. Yet in this sensitive and thoughtful account of the representative agonies at City College, the issue of how to improve the ballot appears as a concern, when it appears at all, only dimly and fuzzily, like a photograph in soft focus. We have only to evoke the symbols of Vietnam and Watergate to be reminded that persons who, on the whole, enjoyed considerable success in meeting conventional standards of excellence, supported in significant measure by voters with comparable histories, led us all too willingly into tragedy and scandal. One need not regard higher education as culpable for this state of affairs to raise the critical question: What is the relationship of baccalaureate-level education to effective and large-minded citizenship, and are there other avenues through which the continuing education of the voter must be pursued if representative democracy is to fulfill its promise?

These two questions and the issues associated with them, so rarely articulated and yet so urgently relevant, are deeply entangled in at least two centuries of American history. No perception of the intimate and subtle connections between education and a free society has been sharper or more keenly felt than Thomas Jefferson's: 'If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.'[1] As early as 1786, he wrote to George Washington, 'It is an axiom in my mind that our liberty can never be safe but in the hands of the people themselves, and...the people with a certain degree of instruction. This it is the business of the state to effect...' For Jefferson, universal public education through schools defined the underpinning and the protection of a society aspiring toward democracy, and from that fountainhead has flowed, sometimes in a deep and broad stream and sometimes in a trickle but never broken, the influences that have shaped our educational system. Jefferson's successors include Horace Mann, for whom the schools were the instruments of all human progress, John Dewey, for whom they were the tools by which a society fashions its own fate, and our current state of affairs in which, in spite of dissension and an erosion of faith, the school still amounts, in the words of Dennis W. Brogan, that astute Scottish observer of the American scene, to 'America's formally unestablished national church.'[4]

Once again we encounter unspoken and unexamined assumptions. Although the Jeffersonian tradition emphasizes equality of opportunity in education, that emphasis is cabined by extraeducational considerations, and education is synonymous with schooling. In Jefferson's Virginia, equality of access applied only to white families and primarily to the sons of those white families. Then as now, the problem was the Orwellian one: On **The Animal Farm**, some animals are always more equal than others.

Similarly, there has been an historic linkage between education, including higher education, and the prevailing winds of social and political sentiment. With schools furnished by the state and conceived as a part of the machinery of the state, this connection hardly constitutes a surprise. Even Dewey's philosophy of education acquired its contours from the dynamics of industrial technology as a dominant social force, and it served the ends of competitive capitalism.[5] Educators (meaning the official personnel of schools, including colleges and universities) have consistently functioned as agents of socialization; and sometimes unthinkingly, sometimes with considerable deliberation, they have, as Sennett and Cobb[6] have

movingly documented, used the schools as mechanisms of social control to maintain class distinctions. And education through the schools has been regularly regarded, especially by political liberals, as the medicine of choice for curing the social ills that occur in a capitalist economy. Education is not only a route to citizenship and a means of self-development; it is the relatively painless vehicle for social reform. The disproportionate burden carried by schools in the contemporary effort to redress racial injustice represents only one current example of this deeply rooted and seldom reflected upon historic commitment.

This commitment seems to lie at the base of a curious inconsistency in the egalitarian position. That position tends to become passionate about education, both substantively and in the sense of sheer access to schools, as the preferred if not the only way to accomplish fundamental and lasting change in the political and social spheres. Yet education distinctively represents the concern for standards that clashes directly with egalitarian values; and quality education, especially in schools and colleges of high prestige, remains affiliated with human differences and their perpetuation. The liberal faith in schooling survives partially by ignoring this state of affairs.

Part of the durability of that faith may lie in the primary ideological and theoretical sources on which social egalitarians tend to draw. The deep wells of ideas here are, of course, Rousseau and Marx, together with their more recent descendants. Rousseau supplies the central notion that no citizen enjoys rights that lack congruence to the General Will, to which the needs and desires of every member of society contribute in strictly equal measure; from Marx comes the key vision of the classless society, italicized by his concept of its inevitability. But the probably irreversible complexities of contemporary culture---the technological, technical, and mangerial aspects of modern social life---raise real questions about the applicability of Rousseau's formulations, which couple a romantic utopianism with the agrarian experience of the eighteenth century. And most of us forget that the Marxian dictum of 'to each according to his need' is far from synonymous with 'to each the same.' Strikingly, in the Soviet Union, from Lenin's initial and ongoing reliance on a special meritocracy to today's self-definition by the Party as Russia's most prominent elite, social egalitarianism remains far from cultural reality.

As early as 1835 in the United States, Alexis de Tocqueville, that remarkable observer, discerned the directions of flow in the values woven into the fabric of democracy in the American style. Equality before the law would become equality in economic circumstance; equality of opportunity would merge with equality in achievement, and rights and principles would become indistinguishable from actualities and functional conditions. A powerful rationale for these directional dynamics, so harmonious with the spirit of Rousseau and Marx if foreign to their particular designs, has recently been furnished by John Rawls.* A magisterial, admirably reasoned work of jurisprudence, Rawls's argument holds that the proper fundamental goal of society is justice. Justice is fairness, and the ineluctable essence of fairness is equality. Equality must be understood not as a set of opportunities but as a state or condition of individuals. The differential distribution of social benefits---income, net worth, social status, etc.---as determined by the marketplace is, therefore, unjust. A 'principle of redress' becomes necessary, under which society

explicitly and deliberately gives more attention to and invests more heavily in those whose birth places them in less favorable competitive positions.

In many ways, this conception of justice undergirds the opposition in many colleges and universities to any condition that smacks of competition in intellectual activity. Competition discriminates, particularly against those who have suffered disadvantages in acquiring the essential skills and the kind of self-confidence relevant to intellectual or cognitive tests of competence. Further, competition entails the experience of defeat and discouragement, especially among those whose greatest needs are for positive reinforcement. If there are to be processes at all that distinguish among people on the basis of ability and performance, and that consign them to different lines of development as a consequence of the distinctions made, then justice requires that the processes furnish those who need them the handicaps and the special helps that permit their staying in the race. In order of both importance and time, equality precedes quality. (There are exceptions---in the selection of Olympic swimmers and Pro-Bowl football contenders, for example, where the whole society turns meritocratic!)

On the other hand, the proponents of excellence hold with Michael Young[9] that 'Civilization does not depend upon the stolid mass, the *homme moyen sensuel* but upon the creative minority, the innovator who with one stroke can save the labor of 10,000, the brilliant few who cannot look without wonder, the restless elite who have made mutation a social, as well as a biological fact.' Although the differences among people are not inherently rooted in class or ethnic identity, and although the differences are far from a simple function of hereditary influence, they remain real and irreducible. Individuals vary in ability, interest, and drive, and the variation means a good deal more than that one person may be good at one activity and another good at some other task. Anthony Quinton has summed up this point of view this way: 'Almost anyone can adequately remove garbage, load and unload trucks, work on an assembly line, clean the floors of office buildings. Rather few people can effectively perform brain operations, manage large industrial enterprises, play Hamlet, judge complex legal cases, investigate the fine structure of matter.'[10] It is education of high quality and training in demanding discipline, provided for people of superior capabilities and strong aspirations, that contribute to civilization and that furnish society with those services crucial to its maintenance and enhancement. Even when this form of education entails technical complexities, it remains true to the humanistic tradition because humanity's future depends upon it.

Occupying the same platform, Lionel Trilling has sounded a somber note.[11] In Western culture, he reminds us, there has been a tradition of progression through apprenticeships, through the cultivation of those skills that enabled one to move from the status of novice to that of master. Currently, especially in the United States, that tradition of personal development is *in extremis*. We prize self-determined choices in type of work and in career, in location, in interpersonal relationships. In struggling against any condition that evokes a sense of being confined or constrained, we struggle against discipline and the idea of progressing from limited abilities to more refined and more broadly applicable ones. Similarly, we exemplify the syndrome of **now**. We demand immediate access to schools and

jobs. We expect automatic promotions. We are unwilling to delay personal gratifications in the pursuit of long-range goals, and we deny the reality of failure and the necessity for recovering from failure. The long, grueling sequences of active learning, of growing through the expenditure of effort and the application of aptitude, of accumulating achievements over time, are not for us. In extolling rights over qualifications, we refuse to pay the price of quality. Consequently, Trilling concludes, because discipline and commitment are fundamental to understanding the humanistic tradition and to earning a place within it, we are more likely to surrender that tradition than to submit ourselves to its norms and requirements even though those norms and requirements identify most of what has been best and brightest in human history.

Trilling's prophecy is clear: Quality will probably yield to equality as a dominant social value with the result that an essential component of democratic society will be lost. Confronted by such a possibility, it is hard to suppress an awareness that, in spite of enormous efforts to the contrary, Americans continue to draw apart. Our cities stand as disturbing witnesses to this tendency. Against the influence of massive federal programs, passionate local efforts, and expenditures of billions of dollars, our urban centers display a powerful central trend: Their cores increasingly become the homes of the poor and the unskilled, whereas their suburban and exurban rings become increasingly the homes of the economically comfortable and the skilled, the managerial, and the professional. Conceivably, education---especially so long as we equate education with sheer schooling---can undergo a comparable kind of division. To some degree, it already has. Quality institutions coexist with those serving in some significant measure egalitarian purposes. In general, the children of the lower class attend the latter; those of the affluent enroll in the more elitist, specifically academic schools, colleges, and universities. Although a caricature, the portrait is recognizable. There may be something for every one, but we have yet to answer seriously the question of whether every one has something of equal worth.

Here we meet a major policy issue---the issue of whether the conflict between quality and equality can be effectively resolved by arrangements that permit all to enjoy the latter but only some to benefit from the former. Quality without equality flies in the face of the aspirations of social democracy. Contradicting those aspirations, it can, at best, provide only partial satisfactions. It reminds us of baseball before desegregation. But it is fundamentally important to remember that Jackie Robinson brought more than equality to the major leagues; he brought a fierce commitment to the highest levels of quality, and that commitment and his driving competence proved the keys to the successful integration of the sport. On the other hand, equality without quality is a condition without mechanisms for maintaining or improving itself. Equality can neither be defined, defended, nor diffused without acknowledging and adopting standards of quality; and without norms of achievement, equality may engender a short-lived and protective sense of security, but it can never evoke pride or an invigorating feeling of identity. The principle of quality can and has functioned effectively without egalitarian accompaniments; there is no way in which the principle of equality can survive or give

life to a society over time without generating and honoring indices of quality. The history of revolutions, most of which have been failures despite their humane claims, is instructive on this point.[12]

Quite possibly, we are dealing here with what E. F. Schumacher[13] calls a **divergent** problem. Divergent problems differ in kind from **convergent** problems. Convergent problems are solved by isolating an essentially self-contained system, developing the lines of evidence germane to that system, and performing the manipulations, both experimental and symbolic, that can be educed by logic. The high business of science, engineering, and technology lies with convergent problems.

But there is another class of problems that tends to arise when self-awareness, conscious choice, and value commitments become intimately involved and where basic polarities are encountered, like growth versus decay or freedom versus order or justice versus mercy. Such problems cannot be solved through the discovery or creation of some analogue to a correct formula. They can only be transcended through the introduction of some more overarching component of human experience. Instances of this kind of transcendence entail applications of wisdom, a recognizable and genuine if only dimly apprehended and not entirely reliable attribute of humanity; or they illustrate the working of feelings honored the world over despite the only too familiar limits on their exercise---love, for example, or compassion or empathy.

In a fashion relevant to our concerns here, Schumacher points out the rare insight in the joining of *Fraternité* to the major terms in the slogan of the French Revolution, *Liberté* and *Egalité*. The latter are irreconcilable opposites. Once liberty is enshrined and unbridled, the strong prosper, the weak suffer, and there is no trace of equality. On the other hand, the insuring of equality requires strict and severe curtailments of liberty. But the antagonism between these two values melts away when they are transcended by fraternity, the vision of brotherhood. Either liberty or quality can be initiated by legislative action and sustained for a time by the state's enforcement powers. Fraternity, however, lies outside institutional controls and can be achieved only by moral effort, the never completely successful pursuit of an acknowledged ideal. In commonplace contexts, this kind of coping occurs with quiet frequency. In a family comprising two older and vigorous boys and two younger and petite girls, a high degree of freedom can obtain without restricting the autonomy of the girls because familial affection controls the greater power possessed by the boys. At law, the sentencing discretion of judges and the processes of appellate review are, when they function at their best, imperfect but workable devices for discovering the wisdom that harmonizes justice (which, he perceived, without justice 'is the mother of dissolution'). In the debate over quality and equality, some similar integrative vision and mechanism may be necessary to permit our enjoying the high merits of both.

It may help to remind ourselves once more that societies motored by democratic aspirations and formed against a background of democratic principles have a central obligation. That obligation is the never ending and never fully accomplished Jeffersonian one of improving the quality of the vote. The ongoing task of upgrading the vote---in its capaciousness of sympathy, in its grasp of complex issues, in its

trenchancy of judgment---puts a special premium on the processes of both teaching and learning at the very core of a culture concerned with its democratic potentials. This central social emphasis carries two implications: Opportunities for teaching and learning must be spread widely through our institutions and as a feature of our corporate experience, and participation in the functions of teaching and learning is both a right and a responsibility of **all** citizens. Within this pattern of opportunities and genuine participation, real distinctions remain. Full involvement in teaching and learning, for example, is not the same thing as a *carte blanche* to enter the medical school of one's choice regardless of qualifications. It does not legitimize the substitution of standards developed by political means to serve political ends for the criteria of excellence inherited and cultivated for eight centuries by the university. It carries no denial that the dimensions of talent vary widely through any human population at any moment. But it insists on two basic and major propositions: One is that the varieties of socially worthwhile and necessary abilities are far more numerous than those that exclusively academic institutions are designed to serve; the other is that concepts of quality other than those that dominate colleges and universities are both valid and essential.

In a manner at once pedestrian and important, simultaneously significant for occupational mobility and for human services, we can draw an illustration here from public health. Obviously, no one dissents from the view that a badly qualified physician is a dangerous social liability; the maintenance of high standards in medical education benefits everyone. But the fundamental nature and position of teaching and learning in our society entail a direct rejection of the notion that there is only one way that medical education can be disseminated and only one way that it can serve the health needs of our people. Moreover, that same dynamic energizes a restless search for other relevant and productive forms of health-related education and for other links between teaching and learning and a higher overall quality of health care. As a consequence, we have programs for paramedics and assistant physicians, so successful and sufficiently widespread that they no longer stand as objects of controversy or as novelties. Yet they represent opportunities for persons lacking the qualifications for full-scale physicianship but who, largely through their experience, demonstrate capabilities of enormous social worth and who, realizing those capabilities through two-year training periods, enjoy careers that broaden and upgrade our system of health care.

Similarly, American doctors in Central and South America and elsewhere have usefully extended the idea of the assistant physician. They have successfully taught basic diagnostic skills and medical observation techniques to villagers within the areas served by fully equipped hospitals. By telephone and other devices of communication, these people consult with fully qualified physicians, obtaining advice and the supervision necessary to their treating minor ills and injuries. The doctors can invest their special skills where they are most needed, use the facilities of the hospital in a more humanly efficient fashion, and improve the quality of health care in the communities to which they are responsible by enlarging participation in the network of teaching and learning. Closer to home, the medical society and the hospital in Grand Rapids, Michigan, conduct six-month training programs for

police, emphasizing both diagnostic procedures and the emergency treatment of such syndromes as cardiac arrest. Again, the ease and frequency of interchange between patrolmen on the beat and doctors and technicians in the hospital are paramount. On this kind of collaboration rests not only a more effective brand of health care, but a new dimension in police work and a new self-image for peace officers. In Seattle, following a comparable pattern, a program focused on heart disease has been opened to all interested adults.

The importance of these enterprises lies in their demonstration that a new standard of quality can emerge from the creation of new relationships between the processes of teaching and learning and a recognized societal need. Were there only one means of disseminating skills and understandings to serve the public interest, then all of us would balk at the application of egalitarian principles to professional opportunities. None of us wants to be operated on by an unqualified surgeon, to drive over a bridge built by an engineer without standards of safety and sound construction, or to be defended in court by a lawyer whose credentials are empty of competence. But when there are many ways of relating teaching and learning to the community's requirements, then monolithic conceptions of excellence stand in the path of genuinely progressive developments, and constructive imagination seems more in order than a tense or terrified shoring up of long unexamined conventions. If we have attended so far only to new ventures in public health, we have nevertheless a basis for expecting similar inventiveness and vision to produce new and useful ventures in legal service, in the public presentation of the arts, in the cultivation of technical competences of value in industry and commerce, in the stabilization of emergent forms of family life, in extending developmentally facilitative services to children and the aged. At various levels and following a variety of tentative models, such movements are already stirring.

These stirrings illuminate the vitality of teaching and learning when they are recognized as culturally central and far more comprehensive than the honorable and necessary but more limited process of sheer schooling. They also suggest that equality of participation adds substance to equality of opportunity and avoids that studied and ultimately self-defeating refusal to acknowledge individual differences that so cankerously infects the idea of equality of condition. From two angles of regard, we begin to glimpse the harmonizing factor that may reduce the conflict and the acrimony in the clash between quality and equality. From one perspective, we can at least begin the imaginative construction of a society that supplies for every one a number of entries into significant functions and into modes of understanding on which self-esteem and a sense of place in one's community depend. From another, we can identify some of the means by which the notion of excellence can be extended through the creation of new standards as new services are established, new networks of relationships come into being to furnish them, and new levels of binding teaching and learning to social needs are conceived. It is hard to think of a profession, a trade, or a form of voluntary service that could not profitably examine its potentials along these lines; and as is clear, cooperation with academic institutions represents one more source of enrichment for the participative enterprise.

At least the rudiments of a useful social policy begin to show through this concept

of educative experience as the affair of all society, of extensive collaboration between academic institutions and a variety of other organizations to extend skills and comprehension through the many realms of as yet unmet public interest. In the near term, for example, federal support might facilitatively be shifted from educational services aimed at particular segments of society to groups characterized by two primary attributes: Their main purposes and concerns lie outside the formal and traditional practice of education, and they have a reasonably sustained record of initiative and success in bringing different populations into a cooperative relationship to meet social needs through teaching and learning. An illustrative list of nominees may identify something of the range and variety of potentially fruitful possibilities here:

Adopt a Grandparent: an organization in Connecticut that enlists older adolescents and young adults to provide recreational and instructional services for the aged.

American Bar Association---Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship: a prestigefully based, imaginative, and remarkably successful effort to introduce into elementary schools relevant studies of the law and our legal system as determiners of personal and social experience.

Black Liberation School: an Ann Arbor venture in which high school students serve as tutors for children in a nonacademic environment.

Children's Art Bazaar Art Gallery: a coalition in Saint Louis of high school students and professional curators to display art created within the community and to provide a forum to raise community consciousness of the values of art.

Executive High School Internships of America: a program that currently places about 2,000 students per year as unpaid but full-time assistants to governmental and business organizations and other agencies in their local communities.

National Commission on Resources for Youth: a group that collects and organizes information for youth about opportunities for involvement in community development and community service projects.

National Student Volunteer Program: a national effort to provide training for teachers and coordinators in volunteer programs that enroll high school students.

Students Concerned with Public Health: a program in Philadelphia that trains and supervises college and high school students to discuss issues in public health in elementary schools and in other agencies where children can be reached.

Students Work with the Handicapped: a California program that mobilizes high school seniors and college freshmen to work with both children and adults who suffer from disabilities and who need both recreational opportunities and training in personally or occupationally useful skills.

To name this handful of projects and organizations demeans in a regrettable fashion the literally scores if not hundreds of other agencies and groups whose efforts command at least equal recognition. The central point, of course, is simply that

there is a wealth of resources available **now** for the implementing of the kind of policy under discussion here.

One major purpose of such a policy would be the reinforcement and expansion of trends significantly reflected in current (and largely unsupported or minimally funded) programs. These trends are of three fundamental types. First, they relate the processes of teaching and learning in relatively novel ways and often in quite novel environments to well specified human needs in some particular group or of some particular kind. Second, they engage in a collaborative fashion segments of society that ordinarily have little to do with one another---children and youth, young people and the aged, amateurs and professionals, adolescents and the executives of business firms and other orgnizations, the whole and the handicapped. Third, they generate new criteria of excellence and new standards of performance in humanly and socially significant settings, demonstrating that the dimensions of quality exemplified in higher education, despite their undeniable and critical importance, do not account for all the paths to personal growth and fulfillment through achievement and the refinement of ability.

The factors of achievement and refined abilities provide the basis for a second major purpose. As Guilford and his colleagues[14] have demonstrated, the structure of intellect breaks down into approximately 120 more or less independent components. Despite its diversity in the United States, academic education concentrates overwhelmingly on between eight and a dozen of these aspects of the complex of traits that we call intelligence. The kinds of programs considered here permit the cultivation and the honoring of many of the more than a hundred cognitive dimensions that schooling tends to ignore, and they make possible an individualizing of teaching and learning that schools typically find impossible. Once again the potentials for recognizing new standards and for creating new roads to socially meaningful attainments seem to merit a substantial investment.

The realizing of those potentials depends on spreading ever more widely the opportunities for participation in teaching and learning as the processes basic to a society the dynamics of which pivot on democratic aspirations. Democratic aspirations certainly entail an active search for a range of significant social roles that enable each citizen to play a cultural part skillfully and with style, an endless effort to broaden the choices available to individuals as they relate themselves to society, and a continuing exploration of how society may capitalize on the full spectrum of abilities that its members possess. If this complex of tasks defines a critical dimension of public policy and identifies some important legislative directions, it also enters a plea for (and perhaps even demands) a related attitude, an effect, that at once supplies the effective base for participative enterprises and sustains them. That affectively toned point of view closely approaches the sentiment of brotherhood, an affectionate respect for differences. That sentiment may better embody democratic aspirations and the idea of equality of participation than many governmental programs or treatises in political philosophy.

But it imposes a sharp responsiblity on everyone. Samuel Johnson once observed,

> How small of all that human hearts endure
> The part that laws or kings can cause or cure.

If the harmonious resolution of the conflict between excellence and equality certainly needs the service of laws and the wise decisions of executives if not of kings, it cannot be achieved without intensely personal commitments and a sometimes painful effort at the reconstruction of the self. One of the curious dynamics of our time, despite its almost pathological preoccupation with self-cultivation, is a determined insistence on fixing responsibility outside ourselves. The California Supreme Court illustratively has recently ruled, without arousing any special public outcry, that hosts at private social affairs are liable to suit by guests who, driving away from the party, suffer accidents as a consequence of their having drunk too much. This action puts sheer self-indulgence and faulty impulse control on some one else's doorstep; in doing so, it undermines the ideas and the ideals of self-determination and personal accountability in which any workable conception of democracy must be grounded. The necessary counterpart of an affectionate respect for differences is recognition and acceptance of one's own differences and the assumption of responsiblity for the directions in which one's distinctiveness expresses itself. It is then that the sentiment of brotherhood transcends mere piety and acquires genuine meaning; it is then that public policy enjoys the authenticity and force that come only when it reflects the predominant values of the people.

The values of brotherhood are caught in a particularly noteworthy fashion in the epigraph, which includes his title, that Eric Sevareid selected for his autobiography.[1] Together with his late associate, Edward R. Murrow, and after Murrow's death, Sevareid created the highest standard of excellence yet achieved in electronic journalism, which is intensely egalitarian because, out of economic necessity, it must successfully appeal to the widest possible audience. Sevareid's accomplishment amounts to a striking reconciliation of quality and equality through the investment of his imaginative talents and his faith in the extended participative learning opportunities that television newscasting can (though it seldom does) present. There is real significance, therefore, in his identifying his life's story with lines written by Norman Corwin for a radio play:

> Post proofs
> That brotherhood is not so wild a dream
> As those who profit from postponing it
> Pretend.

From the stance of brothers, with affectionate respect for differences, we can refuse the ugly and self-defeating choices that result from pitting equality and quality against each other and find our way to those social arrangements that permit excellence in a variety of forms to blossom from the diversity that our population comprises. When we are free, like brothers, not from the heat of productive argument but from the hatred of divisive faction, then that diversity defines our greatest source of humane strength.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Theodore L. Gross, 'How to Kill a College.' **Saturday Review**, 1978 (4 Feb.), Vol 5 (No. 9), 13-20

[2]See, for example, Sidney Hook, **Pragmatism and the Tragic Sense of Life** (New York: Basic Books 1964). See also Miguel de Unamuno's **Tragic Sense of Life**, easily available in a Dover paperback.

[3]In a letter to Col. Charles Yancey dated 6 January, 1816. It is reproduced in Vol. 10 of Paul Leicester Ford's ten-volume **The Writing of Thomas Jefferson** (New York: Putnam, 1892-1899). The letter to Washington is in Vol. 9 of Julian Boyd's remarkable and comprehensive **The Papers of Thomas Jefferson**, published by the Princeton University Press and projected as a 50-volume labor of scholarly love.

[4] Dennis W. Brogan, **The American Character** (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1944). Brogan, a Scot, has proved one of the most insightful foreign observers of American social processes in the twentieth century; fundamentally sympathetic, he is simultaneously informed, perceptive, and tough-minded.

[5]Dewey by Robert J. Roth, himself a Jesuit, **John Dewey and Self-Realization** (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963) and by Robert J. Bernstein, **John Dewey** (New York: Washington Square Press, 1967).

[6]Richard Sennett and Jonathan Cobb, **The Hidden Injuries of Class** (New York: Random House, 1972). Based on intensive personal interviews, this study focuses on the extra-economic sources of tension between social classes and on the anxiety and discontent felt by those excluded from the sources of cultural satisfaction and personal fulfillment to which the educationally advantaged have such special access.

[7]Few influences can claim the magnitude or the pervasiveness of Rousseau. In many ways, his ideas have become so imbedded in our complex Euro-American traditions that there are many today who, never having read him, still speak with his voice. The two most important works in the present context are **Emile** and **The Social Contract**, both widely available in inexpensive editions. Because of Rousseau's importance, Lester G. Crocker's **Jean-Jacques Rousseau** (New York: Macmillan, 1973) richly repays a careful reading; in two volumes, it is a masterly analysis of the life and writing of one of the most seminal figures of the last three centuries.

[9]From the standpoint of the sociology of knowledge, John Rawls's **A Theory of Justice** (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1971) commands special interest. A first-rate work of scholarship, it is a major contribution to the philosophy of law; it represents a direct continuation of an intellectual tradition, and it emerges, like Minerva from the forehead of Zeus, fullblown from the contemporary liberal *Zeitgeist*. De Tocqueville's great and almost uncannily prescient **Democracy in America** can be had in a number of editions. A useful one for its readable type and the inclusion of John Stuart Mill's appraisal of the book is the two-volume text published in New York in 1961 by Schocken Books.

[10]Michael Young, **The Rise of the Meritocracy** (New York: Random House, 1959). Subtitled, 'The New Elite of Our Social Revolution,' this amusing, informed, and provocative book deals with the 'history' of the redistribution of abilities over social classes between 1870 and 2033 in England. Witty at times to the point of hilarity, it merits occasional rereading for its good tempered but firm insistence that short-run forms of social redress may have the long-term effect of concentrating talent and authority in a narrower rather than a broader segment of society.

[11]Anthony Quinton, 'Elitism: A British View.' **The American Scholar**, 1975-1976 (Winter), Vol. 45 (No. 1), 719-732.

[12]Lionel Trilling, 'The Uncertain Future of the Humanistic Educational Ideal.' **The American Scholar**, 1974-1975 (Winter). Vol. 44 (No. 1), 52-67. This thoughtful, subtle, and moving essay deals with a theme and poses an issue too much avoided: '...if you set yourself to shaping a self, a life...You preclude any other kind of selfhood remaining available to you...Such limitation, once acceptable, now goes against the cultural grain---it is almost as if the fluidity of the contemporary world demands an analogous limitlessness in our personal perspective. Any doctrine, that of the family, religion, the school, that does not sustain this increasingly felt need for a multiplicity of options and instead offers an ideal of a shaped self, a formed life, has the sign on it of a retrograde and depriving authority, which, it is felt, must be resisted.'

[13]See, for example, Crane Brinton, **The Anatomy of Revolution** (New York: Vintage Books, 1965) and Howard Mumford Jones, **Revolution and Romanticism** (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard, 1974).

[14]E. F. Schumacher, **A Guide for the Perplexed** (New York: Harper & Row, 1977).

[15]See J. P. Guilford, **The Nature of Human Intelligence** (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967) and the various **Reports** issued from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California, Los Angeles 90007.

[16]Eric Sevareid, **Not So Wild a Dream** (New York: Knopf, 1946).

EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND IDENTITY FORMATION IN ADOLESCENCE

Joseph Katz

The Adolescent Stage of Development

I speak to you from the base of nearly two decades of studies in which my associates and I have tried to relate the emotional and personal development of students to the academic and nonacademic environment of the college. I was cheered by some conversations today with members of the Simon's Rock community and by what I have seen in writings from the college that you are one of the still relatively few institutions that take seriously the interplay of the student's emotional and intellectual development.

You have a more pronounced opportunity because you have somewhat younger people at this college. It is even harder with sixteen-year olds than with twenty-year olds to disregard the emotional factor. For instance, self-centeredness stands out more clearly. When we did a longitudinal study of students at Stanford, we had some students taperecord freshmen in their dormitories at night. (This, by the way, is a good time to get certain kinds of research data because the students are very relaxed and spontaneous). In one situation there were three male students talking; each would talk for a while and the others would hardly listen but wait until their turn upon the stage came. Such egocentricity is a characteristic of a stage in adolescent development. But just yesterday I heard a faculty colleague report about a small group to which he belongs saying that professors are really present in the room only when they are talking. Some people never adequately develop beyond some aspects of their adolescent (or even infantile) egocentricity. In general, if we think that identity is achieved by age 22 we are mistaken, and I will return to this question.

At this point I like to outline some basic aspects of adolescence. In a recent popular novel the author describes a group of psychoanalysts on a plane trip to an international congress. 'Besides the analysts, their wives, the crew and a few poor outnumbered laymen there were some children of analysts who had come along for the ride. Their sons were mostly sullen-faced adolescents in bell bottoms and shoulder-length hair who looked at their parents with a degree of cynicism and scorn which was almost palpable.'' (The author does not talk about the daughters of the analysts who must have been there too.) As one reads her account, one's first reaction might be that these people who know more about the unconscious and the affective life than anyone else in the society, have children too who act and feel in this way. It seems that analysts are doing no better by their children than other people. But upon second thought one may realize that even analysts' children go through stages of development and that these are necessary stages of development. There is no escape from adolescence because it is deeply founded in the child's helplessness and dependence, in the child's fantasy which misrepresents reality. It is conditioned by the

problems of the onset of adolescence, the tremendous upsurge of sexual and aggressive impulses that are badly manageable, the pull away from childhood, the fear of being pulled back into it, the search for independence. Anna Freud has described the beginning of this stage by saying that the youngster becomes 'hungrier, greedier, more cruel, more dirty, more inquisitive, more boastful, more egocentric, more inconsiderate than he has been before.'[2]

Nobody can spare his children the problems of adolescence. But one can do better or worse by it when it happens. Simon's Rock is one attempt to do better by it.

To say that adolescence is necessary goes against some investigators who have claimed that it does not happen in Samoa[3] or in many segments of American youth cultures.[4] To me finding the adolescent crises depends on how deeply one digs into the psyche-for the surface manifestations are very uneven. The psychological and physical challenges of puberty seem to mobilize in everyone these tendencies to rebellion, e.g. towards parents, and fierce loyalty, e.g. towards peers, to being aggressive and submissive. Your reports about student life in the Simon's Rock dormitories confirm the presence of some classical adolescent syndromes, such as a certain insensitivity to others.[5]

The push of the college years is towards bringing some order into adolescent turmoil. When I started my longitudinal study of college students in 1961, I was somewhat naively thinking in ideal Eriksonian terms and expecting the achievement of identity by the time that people are college seniors. People do not develop that neatly. For instance, the achievement of occupational identity is still in the future when students graduate from college. Many seniors are still very much playing around with work identities, with anticipations that are vaguely conceived and felt. (This lack of occupational identity is in part due to the nature of the college which does not confront people with real work situations.) Having recently re-interviewed the same people we studied as college students,[6] what strikes me is how much at age 32 the work identity has taken over, often crowding out other aspects of identity, such as friendship, or the pursuit of the intellectual, esthetic, and emotional values encouraged during college.

Also when I started my longitudinal study, I expected an identity crisis in nearly every student, a period of great pain, of confronting alternatives and a transcending resolution and happy integration. We did not find such an identity crisis in a clear-cut form with many students, that is, an identity crisis of the sort that, for instance, many adult women have had in the last decade leading to a fresh perception of women's roles and activities in the light of that perception.

Relation to Authority

While the identity crisis in college students may not be as dramatic as I had expected, everybody experiences some crucial turning points and comes out differently. Almost every senior is more autonomous than he or she was as an entering freshman. For instance, the issues of obedience or living up to parental expectations are felt, thought, and acted on.[7] In our study of undergraduates we found that the turning point vis-a-vis parents came from many students at the end of

their freshman year. When they came home, after having achieved some independence at college, and their parents tried to exert some of the old controls, these students resisted or rebelled. The issue might be over how late they stayed out, how they kept their room, or ideological disputes over politics or the economic system. The students used these disagreements to further their separation from their old home and to build their individual identity.

It is important to realize that the students' progress is based on rather special conceptions of their parents. When you do look at what freshmen say about their parents and compare it with what the same people say as seniors, you are reminded of Mark Twain's assertion about how much the old man had learned in four years. Parents change under the impact of growing children, but the college student changes considerably more. One young woman whom I saw regularly in her freshman year described her mother to me as unintellectual, cold, uninteresting and in her senior year she told me about exchanging books with her mother, her mother going back to school and sitting in front of the fireplace in affectionate embrace with her husband. Clearly this is not a cold, unintellectual, unemotional woman and she could not have changed that much in the four years. The perception of the parent changes and the initial exaggeration is part of the sequence towards individuation.

The first of four aspects of identity formation during college I want to describe is the achievement of autonomy and the implied attitude to authority. In separating from one's parents, the peer group becomes a source of support. Students also look to new authorities that are 'better' and 'purer' than their parents. For instance at one university I knew in the early sixties there was a man who was a pacifist and used to come to the freshman dormitories preaching the virtues of pacificism. In those days pacificism was a relatively bad thing and the deans were apprehensive and came to us for advice whether they should keep the man out of the dorms? Our advice was not to worry and that the students would keep their own counsel. It also was not likely they would turn into pacifists (regrettable as that may be). That is precisely what happened. For some weeks a few students seemed intensively to identify with the pacifist and then they turned to other things. Other students may similarly go through an ascetic period before they become more worldly again. But they are different because of the experience. The temporary identification with a different authority or a different way of doing things brings out a dormant part of their personality and leads towards a more differentiated individuality.

Often one thinks of the adolescents' freeing themselves from authority in negative terms of repudiation. But it also is an eminently positive process which is less emphasized in the conventional wisdom and maybe even in social science. It is not only a process of getting away from authority but of establishing new forms of authority: The authoritativeness of one's self, the internalization of authority. Unless a person has a certain realistic and accepting sense of his or her own desires, limits, and capacities, he or she is going to be something like a radar person and the shifting environments, fads, conventions, 'isms' of the moment will determine behavior and self-concept. A German psychoanalyst has written a book called **Society Without the Father** in which he describes the vulnerability of a society to

dictatorship if citizens have not developed an adequate sense of their own authority. 'If the child has had a really living relationship with its father as with its mother and siblings, the father will remain with it as an inner object long after it has outgrown his immediate influence.'[8] On the basis of identification in childhood and separation in adolescence the person develops and strengthens the sense of inner authority making possible egalitarian friendship with parents in adulthood (and avoiding the search for authoritarian pseudo-fathers).

Interestingly enough in a recent textbook on sociology the author suggests that 'perhaps **any** theory of identity has become superfluous' and that 'the nature of the situation determines the character of the self.'[9] We live in a society in which it seems we need to be different people in different contexts: One kind of person with teachers, another with peers, another in a business setting. Some sociological theoreticians suggest that the adaptation to this complex kind of society makes having a more definite personality an obstacle. Such denial of a more stable (and developing) identity reads like a theoretical codification of the Eichman phenomenon or the Watergate phenomenon. It describes people, once arrogant, who will be contrite when a new context requires it. The post-Nazi period in Germany was one of the most striking historical illustrations of situation-determined 'conversation.' By contrast, the persons who are characterized by a firmer sense of identity will also behave differently in different situations, but there will be a principled reacton from their 'inner core' which will make them go only so far in any specific direction.

For the adolescent, moving towards the internalization of authority is crucial. But the schools make the achievement of that kind of identity difficult. Passivity in learning is very much part even of our higher education system. A very important part of what students learn in their freshman year is how to 'psych out' the professors, to give back to them what is expected. Many students will initially explore on their own the very exciting readings put before them, following their own curiosity and intellectual inclinations. When their first efforts are met with low grades they are likely to turn towards what the teacher wants. Many, perhaps most, professors encourage this unwittingly. They are attached to the notion of originality, but it is hard to execute in practice. So the academic process interferes with the achievements of autonomy. What I have recently seen in our study of people who are 32 is a continuation of passivity, except that the corporation or the law office has taken the place of the school.

The mitigation of the tendency to be passive I see as one of the tasks that any college dedicated to furthering the cognitive and affective life of its students would address itself to. There are two sorts of things that are underdeveloped in traditional college environments: Academic work is not sufficiently related to experience and to reality and it is not sufficiently related to opportunities in which students can use their thought to make a difference. Let me illustrate. Stanford ran a volunteer program in which undergraduates went overseas to Asia to teach in schools, work in hospitals, and the like. These students discovered that what they knew made a difference. They had to think hard in order to get across to their students what they were trying to teach them. They faced pedagogical problems, disciplinary problems.

When these students came back, they often knew for the first time what they wanted to study, what they might want to do with their lives. There was an animation to their thinking that many of them had not had before.

Opportunities to develop and test the use of ideas in real settings are rare in the conventional colleges. Hence students do not sufficiently internalize reasoning. Reasoning for many of them remains something of a game. College becomes a large simulation room. I remember one of the brightest students I have ever had who took my course simultaneously with that of a colleague. By accident we compared the two final examinations. Though we were good friends, my colleague was in some ways diametrically opposed to my kind of thinking. As I read the student's paper for my course I had the illusion that she had completely absorbed my way of thinking, was completely in agreeement with it, understood it in such a way that she really could not say such nice things, express so much agreement with my colleague's thinking as she turned out to do in her paper for my colleague. In fact, she probably took neither of our views very seriously. Her superb performance made me wonder whether there was not something to the discredited theory of the mind as a muscle.

Intellect is not taking hold sufficiently in most of our students. One might suggest that a certain libidinization of intellect is necessary. Learning needs to become almost a love object. Hence it is that students will refer with so much approbation to teachers who show enthusiasm. That enthusiasm suggests both some passion and that learning can be a source of pleasure. By contrast, so many of our academic ways, including the training of graduate students[10] are rather pressured and grim business, though the excitement is there too in some measure. Professional meetings can be full of monotones.

Impulse Expression

One of the important tasks of adolescence is the development of the impulse life of the student. Now we know of certain special occasions when students are exuberant in the expression of their drives, such as Ft. Lauderdale in the spring or certain fraternity events. On such occasions impulse gets free but only very temporarily so; it does not become integrated into the personality (and in later life these people may allow themselves sporadic impulse expression, e.g. at a convention, while otherwise leading rather colorless, compliant or driven lives). In many respects students need not so much to have their impulses controlled as to have them stimulated. They often tend towards conformity, towards being 'good,' to do as expected, to 'learn' by way of psyching out the professor. These things are inimical to the development of the impulse life. I envisage some happy balance between control and expression of impulse.

I want to take an illustration from the domain of 'negative' impulse, the management of hostility. In the documents from Simon's Rock already mentioned there was a reference to students' hurtful behavior towards each other. That kind of behavior is in part age-specific: the inconsiderateness, egocentricity of adolescence, the continued force of sibling rivalries. One or two years later the outward

manifestations may abate. But that is not the end of the story; parts of the cruelty and nastiness may go underground. Behavior becomes polite and more controlled on the outside, but it does not become properly controlled; the cruelty may express itself, for instance, in the kind of talking that goes on behind the back of people. The story might have been different if a genuine confrontation with hostility had been possible. In our study of undergraduates we found such situations as people having inconsiderate roommates who would keep the lights on late while one wanted to sleep or who would have forbidden pets in the room even though one had an allergy to them. Students went to great trouble in order not to confront the offending roommates with their feelings. They would be out of the room as much as possible, study in the library, come back only at the last moment. Sometimes things would explode and nobody could understand how come a nice situation would all of a sudden become so nasty.

We have here one instance in which an assertive impulse, and it may originally not be hostility, is not properly understood, is not properly subjected to self-searching, is not communicated, and hence festers underground. Legitimate assertion then turns to hostility. Or the person shrinks from expression and becomes submissive, goes around apologizing, forever feeling that he or she did something wrong. These feelings are not very comfortable to live with. Education of impulse is a needed, though neglected objective.

Relationships

I turn briefly to the very important area of relationships with others. The movement through the college years is a movement from egocentricity towards enhanced awareness of other people, greater ability to be responsive to them and care for them. Nearly everybody goes through this in one fashion or another. This maturational process is probably helped by the college situation because of the proximity of many other kinds of people.

I want to call your attention to two things that do not sufficiently happen. When we looked at the seniors in the last year of our longitudinal study, we found their social behavior much more smooth and polished. They were no longer the sometimes awkward, gangly, or self-conscious people they had been as freshmen. They knew better how to keep a conversation going. They knew better how to cooperate with other people. But so many of them found true intimacy still elusive. There were feelings of walls, of distance, of not really reaching through. For many this continues into the years after college.

The other unfinished task in the movement towards others is in the area of the capacity for concerted action. Our study of people ten years after college shows them to be very 'privatistic,' in spite of the fact that some of their undergraduate and graduate student years were spent during the period of intense student activism. Few of them had even modest involvement in activities directed towards social betterment. Part of this privatism is a consequence of the conditions of the college: the 'individualism' encouraged by the grading system and teacher-oriented learning in the classroom with minimum encouragement of student-to-student learning.

There is a neglect of developing the capacity of acting in concert with other people towards the solution of common problems, of learning the ways of cooperative formal and informal action. The organization, the hierarchy, the bureaucracy of schools and businesses make such concerted actions difficult. All the more reason to begin learning it in college. I mean concerted action that transcends the simplifications which for instance personalize problems as being due to evil authorities, an adolescent propensity I find in many faculty members when they talk about the administrators of their colleges.

I have talked about three central areas in the formation of identity: (1) separation from and the development of internalized authority, (2) the freeing and the governance of impulse, (3) capacity for intimacy with, caring for, and working with, others. I have not talked about a fourth area: the growth of thinking from a more absolutist to a more relativist phase allowing for complexity, both tolerance and ambiguity and willingness to pursue inquiry, experiment, and action on the basis of a reasoned, however tentative, hypothesis. I trust Bill Perry will have much to say about this tomorrow.

Some Implications for Simon's Rock

I would like to address my final set of remarks briefly to some applications of what I have said to Simon's Rock College. I was asked several questions in an advance document sent to me from the College. One question was whether early college admission is desirable, whether students are ready for college at an earlier age. My own way of thinking is to turn that question around. It is a question of the institution's suitability for the student, not of the student's for the institution. Education is suitable at any age, but the question is: given the people you have, what can you do for them, how can you facilitate their learning? I know few, if any, colleges in this country in which many faculty are not dissatisfied with the composition of their student body, in which they are not saying that there should be a different selection, in which they do not think that they deserve students more worthy of their efforts. This holds true for faculty from the elite institutions and down the academic ladder. We have eleven million students in our colleges and universities and our task by taking their money and the state's money is to try to have them come out better than they went in, beyond such obviously socially useful tasks of keeping young people off the streets and out of trouble.

Your program of taking people earlier than other institutions has the challenge of educating people at a time in their lives when the relation between the emotion and the intellect is more visible, more out in the open. So you can confront the problem of the integration of the two **before** the affective bases of thinking become more hidden. But, I have been asked, aren't the more mature students handicapped by the presence of the less mature students? That, to my mind, depends on the proportions of the less mature students and on the deployment of the more mature. Do the more mature students get support from each other, do they get special support from their teachers, are they enlisted in aiding the less mature--creating a more ideal

sibling situation. If these things are done, the more mature students are not disadvantaged and at the same time benefit the others. In fact, I have not yet heard reports from any institution in which students have been used as teachers of other students where the mutual benefits have not been extolled.

Another question I was asked is how much support the young Simon's Rock students need, whether more institutional impersonality is desirable? This really is the old question whether we are coddling our students. My answer here is that when you consider the adolescent stage of development, both support and 'impersonality' are desirable. In many ways adolescents want to be left alone to themselves, define their own life, their own culture, in their own terms. They are living in and anticipating a different age than their elders. Also they can be quite inventive. The most notable recent instance is the establishment of coeducational residential living which implied new forms of male-female relationships and new gender roles. This arrangement came directly out of the student culture.

At the same time that students want to and should be left alone, they also want our presence, example, encouragement, and knowledge. Faculty in colleges like Simon's Rock, which have concern for students, walk a tightrope between leaving students alone and giving them support. It is also a tightrope between being a friend and an authority who sets standards and evaluates. It is difficult particularly for some faculty who adhere to the progressive tradition to be firm. For a teacher at your kind of institution a combination of firmness and empathy, of being authoritative and competent and yet understanding, of having a sense of what adolescence is and yet not being swept into it is crucial.

To cope with the problems posed by an individual-centered approach to students, to have a refreshed attitude to them, faculty can be much benefited by opportunities for regular and detailed discussions of their work, if possible under the guidance of people who have a more expert understanding of student and faculty psychology. To quote Anna Freud again: 'While an adolescent remains inconsistent and unpredictable in his behavior, he may suffer but he does not seem to me to be in need of treatment. I think he should be given time and scope to work out his own salvation. Rather, it may be his parents who need help and guidance so as to be able to bear with him. There are few situations in life that are more difficult to cope with than an adolescent son or daughter during the attempt to liberate themselves.'[11] For 'parents' one can substitute 'teachers' whose labor, however, is more mitigated because they do not have the disadvantage of parents who in the words of an adolescent, 'have known us when we were children.'

Finally in regard to the question of what is an appropriate program for 16 and 17 year olds we can take some instruction from the problems of traditional programs. For instance at an elite institution studied by me, freshmen in the required introductory humanities course were deliberately given lower grades at the beginning of the course than they would later. The instructors wished to emphasize the standards and seriousness of the college. When the students engaged in somewhat emotional-laden discussions of issues that had come up in the course,--e.g., the nature of the family, of authority, of religion--the instructors were eager to impress

them that being in college meant that these matters had to be dealt with scientifically.

The instructors were missing the fact that the freshmen were not yet at that stage of development in which they could reason in the manner expected. Their freshmen students were in what I call the ideological stage of development not in the scientific or theoretical one. The important thing to my mind is at that stage not to reject the student's emotionality but to let it be, not for the teacher to fall into it, but to be able to respond to it without putting the student down. The student then can move on to more objective thinking, without that split of emotion and reason that bedevils even some of our best adult scholars. When the emotionalism of the freshman is rejected, a vital part of him or her is rejected and he or she also gets the notion, 'I am not very good at thinking...intellectual discussions are not for me.' It makes it harder for the freshman to view, in Plato's words, reason as a friend.

You, here at Simon's Rock, just because you have students who are unusual because of their age and because they have chosen this college, have an enormous opportunity of putting the question of undergraduate education in a different perspective. You can raise the questions, that too few faculty raise, of what modifications of subject matter and teaching procedures we must introduce if students are truly to become learners and people who feel comfortable with intellect.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Erica Jong, **Fear of Flying** (New York: New American Library 1974) p.5.

[2] Anna Freud, 'Adolescence as a Developmental Disturbance.' In G. Caplan and S. Lebovici, Eds. **Adolescence: Psychosocial Perspectives** (New York: Basic Books, 1969) p.7.

[3] Margaret Mead, **Coming of Age in Somoa** (New York: Morrow, 1928).

[4] See Elizabeth Douvan and Joseph Adelson, **The Adolescent Experience** (New York: Wiley, 1966). The authors are struggling between a psychoanalytic and a cultural perspective.

[5] Gail Hall, **Everyday Life at Simon's Rock** (Great Barrington, Mass.: Simon's Rock Early College, 1977).

[6] Joseph Katz and Rodney Hartnett, **Personality Development in the Third Decade of Life** (in preparation).

[7] Joseph Katz and Associates, **No Time for Youth** (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968).

[8] Alexander Mitscherlich, **Society Without a Father** (New York: Jason Aronson, 1973).

[9] Hans Sebald, **Adolescence: A Social Psychological Analysis,** (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall 2nd edition 1977) pp. 220, 221. The author quotes Peter Sellers: 'I have no personality of my own. I only feel "real" when I'm playing a role.'

[10] Joseph Katz and Rodney Hartnett, **Scholars in the Making** (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1976).

[11] Anna Freud, **Adolescence: The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child,** Volume XIII (New York: International Universities Press, 1958) p. 276.

ADOLESCENCE AND THE SOCIAL SYSTEM

Edward A. Wynne

Any comparatively new institution must be, in part, based on a series of assumptions about the nature of the people and problems that it will deal with. Those assumptions will be modified by the institution's experiences; still, it will be sometime before the assumptions can be subject to a formal objective test, since data cannot be developed until some operations have occurred. Meanwhile, realities of institution-building are such that many policies must be determined with imperfect data, maintained in the face of strong contraindications, and sometimes abandoned before they have been definitively tested.

In contemporary American society, the early college is such a comparatively novel institution. Therefore it must rely, in part, on relatively untested hypotheses based on imperfect evidence. Still, there are degrees of imperfection. And, in the case of institutions working with adolescents and young adults, there is a body of data which may be used to refine the operating hypotheses of institutions such as Simon's Rock. These data, to my mind, argue for the development and maintenance of a selective, demanding institution, whose structure surrounds its students with unique supports as well as demands. But, obviously, the nature of these demands and supports must be carefully defined.

In this paper, I will try to summarize the pertinent evidence, and concurrently derive general principles from it, and then apply those principles to the past and future operations of contemporary early colleges. Although my formal discipline is sociology, my perspective is interdisciplinary, and my discussion will rely on the findings of other academic fields as well as sociology.

There is a bell-shaped curve which basically portrays the distribution of significant human talents, such as the ability to complete a relatively demanding college program; the further 'up' the curve a youth or adolescent is, the more demanding the program he can complete. A modified version of that curve can also portray the distribution of such 'completion ability' in terms of the age of the students; the further up this curve an adolescent is, the earlier the age they are able to enter and complete college. This second curve actually plots both cognitive ability and developmental maturity. Presumably, adolescents at the upper-end of the second curve are appropriate candidates for early colleges. Since over two and a half million Americans attain the age of sixteen each year, my intuition suggests to me that there are an adequate proportion of potential enrollees for a number of such colleges. (After all, eighteen is a typical year for enrollment; unless the curve is incredibly skewed, we should have a good number of 'ready' sixteen year olds). But even this curve-oriented discussion fails to fairly state the case for early admissions. There is ample evidence that the parameters of the curve which defines the proportion of college-ready students in terms of age are subject to social modification. In other words, the median age of college readiness, and the standard deviation about that median, appear to only reflect the developmental tempo of millions of individual adolescents. However, the tempo, itself, is really partly shaped by a medley of external social factors; it is not solely the outcome of things

happening inside the adolescent. Some of these external social factors can be manipulated by schools and college. As a result, parameters of the curve can be changed, and the proportion of potential successful early college enrollees can be increased. Such a change might produce many precious benefits for our youths and society. The basic pattern of these appropriate changes would be to de-trivialize the lives of our young.

There is a good deal of historic evidence supporting my proposition that the developmental curve is manipulable. Indeed, this evidence suggests that we have tended to encapsulate our youths---especially those with significant intellectual or emotional potential---in undemanding environments that reinforce many immature elements of their personalities. For instance, many earlier eras and cultures did not engage in the refined age-grading of the young as it is practiced in modern American schools. The data about these more traditional environments reveal innumerable instances of artists, writers, soldiers, and economic enterpreneurs who produced works or carried-out activities that were far in advance of the talents demanded of typical modern American upper-middle class youths. For confirmation of this proposition, read the works of persons such as Aries, Handlin, or van den Berg. If we better understand the complex general characteristics of these traditional structures, we may be able to evolve a set of principles which can have application in modern institutions, such as early colleges, that are dedicated to the support of diversity.

Essentially, these earlier structures had careful recruitment and enrollment systems, increased the level of demands (and supports) about learners, and provided young people with a greater diversity of demands. Careful recruitment and enrollment lessened the amount of dissonance within and among the learners in the institution. The intensity of demands and supports accelerated cognitive learning and emotional maturation for those with appropriate potential. The diversity of demands provided outlets for a greater variety of human talents than are typically provided by modern youth-serving institutions. As a result of this diversity, while the standard deviation, or spread, on the curve was increased, a greater variety of talent curves was also recognized throughout the society. In effect, a higher proportion of youths were given a chance to excell in some area---if not in book learning, then in fighting, joking, assuming nutrient roles, or displaying physical endurance.

The specific nature of traditional recruitment and enrollment systems will naturally be of interest to persons concerned with the design and management of early colleges. In general, these systems clearly informed the applicant or enrollee about the challenges ahead of them. As a result, youths who enrolled wanted what they got, and youths who did not want such experiences stayed away. This heightened the pool of pro-learning recruits, and reduced dissonance in the institution. Sometimes the knowledge could come from first hand contact: The applicant had lived in close proximity to the institution, or other members of his family had participated in it, and he had been told many anecdotes about what lies ahead. Or, where the nature of the institution was inexactly perceived, ceremonial acts, or powerful symbols, were used to emotionally communicate to the enrollee something about the challenge that lay ahead. Or, again, the physical hardships

involved in travel in more primitive environments required the applicant to display preliminary determination and 'informed' them about physical difficulties of withdrawal or failure, and thus intensified commitment.

In sum, in earlier institutions that 'worked' for young adults, the enrollees had an idea of what they were gettting into, and had a chance to become emotionally prepared. And the act of enrollment was often so ardorous as to make failure unacceptable to the enrollee, after completing his initiation. Some of these traditional institutions were voluntary---religious orders, the armed services; others were of a more mixed nature---such as enrollment in apprenticeships or colleges, where sometimes parents played a critical role. But whether they were voluntary or involuntary, the enrolleee was under powerful pressure to see it through: either because failure would mean a dramatic confession of self-ignorance, or because family or economic pressures would then prove intolerable. If there are any behaviorists present---and I am not hostile to their perspectives---it should be clear that the preceding analysis can easily be restated in appropriate behavioral terms, e.g., when we fail to meet a conspicuous and voluntarily accepted challenge, we assume that our friends and relatives will think less of us---they will negatively reinforce our expulsion or dropping-out.

Of course, not all traditional institutions dealing with the young were this clear-cut; some, like more modern institutions, were relatively experimental for the enrollees, where expectations were vague, both entry and exit were easy, and the learning demands of the institution were comparatively modest. But I would still argue that the experimental, tentative institution is more typical of our era than of previous historic periods or earlier authors.

This comparitively abstract discussion can retain greater clarity if we consider a modern learning institution that still tends to apply relatively traditional recruitment and enrollment structures coupled with high learning demands: the U.S. Marine Corps recruits---male and female late adolescents---voluntarily enroll. They know that they will be subject to great stress during their training; they have relatives and friends who have been in, they have been informed through the media, and recruiting officers probably essentially tell applicants the 'truth'. Of course, the recruit's knowledge is imperfect, since a phenomena such as boot camp is immensely complex. But the potential recruit probably even recognizes that imperfection. In a sense, he is emotionally prepared to accept an awesome and demanding unknown. He is willing to learn and change. The mechanics of admission dramatically inform him that he has entered a new and different environment. He is physically examined, signs papers, swears an oath, has his hair shorn, is given a uniform to wear, and is transported with a number of other strange peers to a remote training camp. These peers are generally composed of youths who desperately want to make it in the Corps. Thus, there is a high level of corporate commitment. At the end of the training, the recruit will be entitled to wear an attractive uniform and be a member of what he perceives of as an elite organization; if he fails in training, he both 'Doesn't make it,' and is humiliated by the realization that he has overestimated his potential. Under all these circumstances, there are powerful pressures pushing and pulling the recruit to learn how to meet the demands of the Corps.

39

Now, to the matter of supports and demands for learning. Any institution concerned with stimulating powerful learning must be concerned with shaping affective as well as cognitive learning. In other words, important cognitive learning cannot occur unless supportive attitudes exist in the learner. And attitudes are learned. The overlapping concern with affective attitudes is especially pertinent for an early college, an institution (a) dealing with adolescents, whose affective responses are mutable, in view of their dynamic developmental level, (b) that is residential, and thus must concern with interaction both in and away-from the classroom, and (c) that aims to develop intellectual excellence, when such an outcome is not always favored elsewhere in education. These factors mean that constructive learning systems in such environments must be composed of a vital intermixture of cognitive material together with an attitude shaping structures. Thus, the succeeding discussion will pay more attention to how we can shape students feelings than to how we can shape their 'minds'. For, without the appropriate feelings in students---which we coloquially term maturity---a college cannot shape student's minds.

Traditional institutions generated powerful learning demands by a variety of means (apart from those already discussed under recruitment and selection). Sometimes, they made failure a clearly defined and realistic possibility; this obviously raised the level of demands. They greatly increased the variety of levels of success, and punished diverse levels of inadequacies. But these distinctions were not so much based on age, as on talent displayed. Even when such distinctions were age related---e.g., it was an honor to be a senior---the understanding was that not all students attained seniorhood; it was not a staus attained simply by putting in time. These various statuses were clearly signified by titles, public symbols, popular privileges, and other reinforcers. The institutions provided examinations, boards, and other tests of mastery which kept standards high, and made excellence prominent. Finally, dramatic symbolic and real rewards were provided for successful graduates.

But as demands increased, so also did supports for learning. Students were grouped in a variety of ways that stimulated them to assist one another, as well as to collectively compete with members of other groups. Mentors and masters (responsible adults or older students) were made formally responsible for assisting new learners, and given thoughtful supervision. A variety of social and athletic activities were encouraged: they were not always under formal adult direction, but there was an understanding that adult-accepted norms should govern such activities. Older learners exercised informal, limited, but real authority over the operation of the system. In its essence, such authority was always subservient to essential adult ends, and simply permitted the older learners to 'test' themselves through acting as adults. But the aim of such exercises was to enable such youths to mimic the acts of effective and responsible adults. Such delegation to older learners increased their stake in the system.

The efficacy of the higher learning demands in traditional institutions should be self-evident. The efficacy of the supports deserves greater discussion. Essentially, the supports aim to 'teach' attitudes and values---affective learning---that enables students to deal with the more strenuous intellectual demands. The supports teach

students to help one another, and thus increase the teaching resources of the school. They also increase the ramifications of the success or failure of each student (whose personal performance can help or hurt his group as well as himself), and thus create new incentives for learning. Mentors and masters provide young students with desireable role models to strive to emulate. The diversity of non-cognitive activities in the school increases the students' attachment to the institution (which provides fun as well as work), and can provide gratification and skill outlets for students who are not supremely academically talented. Such activities also create new groupings of students, or students and faculty, which can provide students with other supportive outlets. Finally, the exercise of authority by older learners offers beginners both role models and incentives for persistence, while the unquestioned retention of essential adult control insures that such authority will not be used to undermine basic institutional principles.

So far, this discussion has generally outlined the principles that have governed many tradtional learning institutions which made high demands on their learners. And, in the process, readers may have seen some contrasts between such systems and many more modern systems. At this point, it now will be more useful to discuss the inter-relationship between such traditional institutions and the perspectives of modern developmental psychology. On a relatively abstract level, there is not a significant contrast; but, operationally, developmental psychology has sometimes been applied---or misapplied---to justify practices in modern institutions which are inconsistent with traditional learning practices. Let me amplify these matters.

Developmental psychology focuses on the progressively increasing learning potential of the child or adolescent. It emphasizes that some forms of learning cannot occur before the learner has internally attained some level of readiness, and that different learners attain such readiness at different tempos. Traditional learning systems often recognized this problem. Some tribes determined the timing of their puberty ritual according to the wishes of the initiates---who, presumably, would refrain from participating until they were developmentally ready. The armed services, and many analogous organizations, have given heavy emphasis to voluntary recruiting, where once again, the learner decides the timing of their own commitment, or whether they want to make a commitment. And, in general, earlier societies, because of their comparatively lax patterns of age grading, often regulated learning demands in terms of the apparent readiness of the learner, in comparison with some abstract number of years. Furthermore, because of the greater variety of learning systems options which confronted talented young people in many societies--work, school, immigration, the armed services, religious orders---the learner's choices were more dependent on the learner's view of their own readiness. (In contrast, in modern society, talented adolescent learners assume that their time will be spent in school, and that careers out of school do not become pertinent until their early twenties.) The sum effect of these traditional patterns was to produce the second of the two bell curve patterns I referred to earlier: to increase the proportion of significantly mature adolescents---really adults---and to generally raise the total level of youth emotional maturity. So much for the congruence between the past and modern developmental principles.

Youths were often under significant adult pressure to make choices among commitments in earlier learning environments; the concept of prolonged sampling and exploration was opposed by both general social norms and the frequently limited economic resources of even more affluent families. Obviously, modern patterns are far more supportive of youths who seek to avoid such choices. Readers will correctly infer that I believe that such support for avoiding commitment defers emotional maturation, and represents a misunderstanding of adolescent developmental needs: even in contemporary society, commitments are still asked and even demanded of adults, and failing to make similar demands on adolescents is often an unjustified denial of their inherent potential to act like adults. Such an approach stifles development, and encourages emotional stagnation in earlier environments. In the past, a youth had made a learning commitment, he was under much more pressure (than is typical today) to see that commitment through. Thus, if the commitment was developmentally premature or otherwise ill-advised, withdrawal was still difficult. Backing-out in the middle of a puberty scarification could be humiliating for life. Running away from the armed services could lead to a dishonorable discharge. Leaving a religious order might bring the penalty of excommunication. It might be economically impossible to return home after immigrating abroad. Apprentices were legally bound to serve out their committed years, and could be punished by law for running away. And so on.

It is not too hard to perceive the general differences between the implicit developmental psychology practiced by traditional institutions and that applied in more modern systems. In modern systems, talented young learners are presented with a lesser variety of learning options, i.e., go to high school and then to college; they are not especially encouraged to accept or pursue diverse ardorous learning demands; and the learning systems they usually enter ask for only modest commitments or allow for comparatively easy withdrawal. Essentially, traditional institutions sought to encourage the development of maturity. Theoretically, the modern systems present young people with less stress-producing demands, and allow them to develop at their 'own' pace. They assume that the pace of development is almost solely determined by things 'within' the adolescent. Many such modern systems grossly underestimate the role external institutions play in determining the rate of development of psychological maturity. True, there may be only a limited amount we can or should do to accelerate the toilet training of two year olds. But there is a great deal we can do to accelerate the willingness of adolescents and youths to accept the responsiblity to support each-other in their college studies, or to make and keep strong personal commitments, either to learning or other desirable options.

In sum, modern systems essentially apply a form of *laissez faire* attitude, and justify that attitude in terms of the alledged developmental needs of the young. Of course, we should also recognize that making serious demands on the young is very hard work, especially when the demander is not receiving large-scale social support--and is thus often seen as mean and petty. And so *laissez faire* satisfies both the philosophical and personal needs of many adults. But 'the young' are not a simple homogenous group. And so a *laissez faire* policy may deprive most adolescents of the

demands and supports they need to stimulate further healthy growth. Their demands and supports would include elements such as:

*An invitation to make a voluntary, strong, persisting commitment to some learning system.

*A definition of what breach or failure of the commitment consists of.

*An understanding of the violation of the commitment may be costly.

*For some youths, the provision of realistic and different alternatives at the time of commitment, so they may enjoy the vital challenge of choice.

*A demanding program.

*The promise of support in carrying out the commitment, and prestige or other rewards for successful completion.

Let us now apply the preceding principles to the design of an early college. Such an application would require us to consider the college's systems of recruiting, selection and enrollment, and the ways it manages the total campus life of its students (and, implicitly, its faculty).

The recruiting system must give students a relatively clear image of what lies ahead. The documents presented must be accurate and, to the extent possible, unambiguous. But, since we are interested in afffective learning---in effecting the attitudes of potential students---papers can only be moderately effective in attaining our end. Different forms of first-hand contact will be most desireable (like the Marine recruiting sergeant). Such contact can come from other students, graduates, and faculty.

In addition to personal contact, various types of on-site visits are also important. Of course, they are most informative if they give potential recruits a chance to taste the program in operation. Traditional institutions often had various forms of novicehood and trial periods, when such sampling occurred. The period of sampling was not indeterminate, and all understood that things looked different after final enrollment---but, still, the sampling was a mode of information transmission. It also communicated to potential initiates the basic respect the institution had for recruits---it did not ask them to sign-up without adequate knowledge. There is no definitive reason why a college cannot attempt variations of these measures. The sampling might even be a one month summer program, during which one class (e.g., the present seniors?) might be obligated to stay on campus to help the potential newcomers, just as they were formerly so assisted themselves.

The college should be reluctant to enroll youths who do not feel, within themselves, that they have some practical alternative to immediately continuing on to college. Without internal recognition of such an alternative, the youth may be faced with many temptations to use studenthood as a period for trying other activities (that he equates with maturity) that are inconsistent with effective studenthood. One measure of such a weighing of alternatives is whether the student has ever successfully held a serious job, or has thoughtfully considered other realistic alternatives to college enrollment. Perhaps every applicant should present a plan about what they wil do if they do not go to college this year.

The college curriculum and credit structure should 'penalize' students who drop out or transfer after---let us say---more than one semester's attendance. I believe

such arrangements can be devised if there is basic institutional willingness. Of course, potential students should be informed of what this means. The college should also have a clear statement of what constitutes intermediate and final 'failure,' both in academic and maturational terms, and what are the effects of failure. Those effects should obviously be of some consequence.

The cognitive program should be demanding, and well-presented. Such a program is partly dependent on the decisions of individual faculty, but the collective faculty and administration can also take steps to increase the demand level. Students can be subject to periodic department and/or college wide exams. There can be few or no pass/fail courses. Curve grading can be generally applied. Numerical grades can be used instead of letters. Class standings can be calculated and published periodically. A variety of department and college-wide achievement awards can be granted. The awards should entitle winners to significant privileges or distinctions, and be presented in public ceremonies, where student and faculty attendance is required.

The matter of support is obviously complex. Each beginning student should be able to identify an upper-grade student and a faculty member who is personally responsible for him. The college should have a reward structure for faculty and students that encourages these mentors to take their obligations seriously; in other words, an upper-grade student whose counselee acts grossly inappropriately should feel a serious sense of guilt and/or be subject to meaningful censure. The mentors should also have some measure of authority over their counselee, and be looked upon by others in that light.

Students should correctly assume that there is a relatively high level of cognitive consistency among the students in the college, and in particular that their peers are genuinely dedicated to the proclaimed learning goals of the college. Each student should see himself as a member of one or more well-defined groups of students working to accomplish some academically related common-end, and who are concurrently competing with equivalent groups. These groups should be partly self-governing and, for instance, should be able to subdivide, among their groups, the grade allocated for their project. Students should also be members of other adult defined and faculty-monitored groups, for the purposes of participating in extra-curricular and service activities. These groups should have significant responsibilities, and a real element of self-government.

Students should be subject to clearly written school rules that give support to formal learning and constructive group activities, and which prohibit and effectively penalize conduct detrimental to these ends. The precise mechanics of the penalty system can vary, but violators of significant rules should feel that, if they are caught they will probably receive serious penalties. The prohibited conduct might include keeping or using drugs or alcohol on campus, being on the campus under the influence of drugs or alcohol, or sexual intimacy among unmarried students on campus. The prohibited conduct is inherently in conflict with the concept of the college as an environment for learning and constructive group activities. The precise forms of these prohibitions might naturally modify in the light of types of living arrangements provided, the mechanics of enforcement, and the application of

different restrictions to students at different age or academic levels. Of course, the proposed rules might not be operative off-campus (though not all off-campus conduct should be 'licensed'). However, the prohibited conduct is inherently less distracting to others off-campus. In other words, when the conduct occurs on-campus, it inevitably affects the feelings and work of others, and is thus obtrusive; it is not simply the business of the users or participants. As we are all realizing, the concept of the victimless crime is a solecism.

Obviously, my rule proposal is an attempt to revive the old tradition of *locus parentis*. Or, to put it in another fashion, to treat students more like adults. For what effective business would hire, retain or promote employees who, while allegedly doing serious work, conspicuously used or displayed drugs or alcohol in the presence of other workers, or who engaged in distracting office romances? Of course, we can always find real or alleged expectations to my proposition in the adults world. Still, my work experience in many environments has demonstrated to me that, pop novelists to the contrary, sobriety and chastity are the norm in important work places. And any graduate looking for a significant job who uttered reservations to those principles would not be considered for employment. In other words, the much heralded abandonment of *locus parentis* was largely the result of the loss of academic nerve---or of academic commitment to take the young seriously.

Changes to increase support for learning will be ineffectual without the back-up of faculty. They must be prepared to work with individual students, advise clubs and other groups, and seriously maintain the rules. Because such back-up may not be attained easily, let me state some of the implicit con- and pro-rationales for the support measures I have presented. The measures may be termed babying, since they do tend to provide students with more help than many institutions. But, on the other-hand, the babying is accompanied with more stringent demands than are also typically faced by students. In other words, many modern colleges provide their students with less demands and support than I propose. Under such circumstances, a very few, highly organized and motivated students use their time wisely, and many others drift through. Too many faculty members have become acclimatized to such low-intensity arrangements. One alternative to my proposal is to increase the level of demands, but refrain from introducing significant supports. Proponents of this approach will argue that it treats the students more like adults, and fosters maturity. But this argument has two flaws. Most students---even talented ones---need more supports than do adults. And even in adult environments (e.g., serious jobs, child-rearing in families) most participants are surrounded by more supports than are found in a typical 'demanding' college (e.g., the supervision is closer, one's colleagues are competent and engaged, and child-rearing is usually handled by two adults who assist one-another). Thus, the college that solely raises demands exaggerates---rather than mirrors---the stress of adult life, while the typical college provides inadequate demands and support.

I understand that some colleges have tried to provide students with appropriate support by relying on a counseling staff. Obviously, I am generally unsympathetic with such proposals, except in the most aggravated instances. The academic and personal adjustment problems of students are usually highly intermingled, and faculty

therefore can be well-qualified to help. Furthermore, since the proposed changes aim to deeply involve faculty with students at a variety of levels (e.g., advising clubs, supervising student groups doing academic work, enforcing rules), it is important that the faculty have a clear commitment of student/faculty engagement. Such a commitment is obviously undermined by the extensive reliance on counsellors; this reliance implies special training is needed to advise most students, and tends to artificially fragment student problems into either academic or personal. The emphasis on professional counseling is also inconsistent with the aim of giving upper-grade students responsibilities for advising other younger students, although such responsibilities---if treated seriously---can stimulate maturity in both the advisee and advisor.

A variety of measures can be used to increase the significance of graduation. Some can be symbolic: the whole student body can attend commencement and the ceremony can be artistically planned, with appropriate weight given to developing traditions and rich spectacle; seniorhood can be designated a special and valuable status; and eligibility for graduation can partly be dependent on a final written and oral comprehensive. Some of the measures can be material: the college might develop a highly effective placement service, which trades-on the special talents possessed by the graduates of a selective and demanding institution; or alumni might be asked to give special consideration to the job needs of their succeeding cohorts.

There are some other modern college practices that bear on my proposals and that warrant discussion.

Many colleges have tended to give students allegedly enlarged roles in the formal governance of the college. This is inconsistent with my proposals. Such grants are rarely as broad as they first seem to students, and they thus engender false expectations and later cynicism among students. The grants are also essentially an inappropriate means to provide students with maturing experiences. Young people need relatively fast feedback to foster constructive affective learning, and college governing bodies are inevitably slow moving and cumbersome---if they are often frustrating for professors, how can we imagine that they will be rewarding for adolescents? Finally, such grants of authority are in conflict with the basic premises of the college. Students and their families are paying $4,000 a year for tuition because the faculty and administration allegedly possess valuable knowledge that the students lack. It is ridiculous for them to pay such fees, and then expect to have a significant say in important decisions about college activities. What would one think about an adult who hired a medical specialist, and then proceeded to reject their directions? Of course, students do need the vital learning that comes from making and following through on difficult (often group-related) decisions. However, those decisions should relate more to extra-curricular activities, service responsibilities and committee-based academic assignments, as compared to deciding how the college should be generally run.

Co-ed dorms also raise questions. (Of course, these 'questions' are modified by the exact restrictions that are placed around such arrangements---and those restrictions do differ between colleges.) While college is a place for work, fun and a certain

degree of personal exploration, work comes first. Or, again, why pay $4,000 a year for tuition? Unmarried sexual relations, especially among the comparatively young, are highly tension-promoting. And such tensions not only affect any pair of partners, but also their peers, and other potential partners, who naturally find that many casual forms of intersexual contacts become fraught with complexity, because of heightened possibilities of such contacts. The comparative ability of students to handle such complexity obviously varies widely. Personally, I find it hard to imagine that the operation of a demanding academic program for sixteen year olds, many living away from home for the first time, would not be seriously hampered by the distractions of students trying to work-through their sexual philosophies in an environment without clear and vigorous norms. Of course, some students may say that they go away to college to engage in such working-through, but this is a misunderstanding of the purpose of college. That's the difference between a college and a commune. A commune may be the place to engage in such testing, if the members want it, and they and/or their parents are willing to pay the costs of operations. But it is a perversion of the purpose of college to treat it as an intersexual testing ground, unless that is its proclaimed purpose---and parents and students clearly know what they are paying for and going to get.

I suspect that some readers may be confused by the apparent group-centeredness of my proposals, and my implicit willingness to push even unwilling students into such participation. Is not this a denial of their right to individuality ? Yes, perhaps so. But adults are often frankly not treated as individuals. Their salaries and other elements of their job status are usually highly dependent on the success of their co-workers or their employer's business. In marriage, their welfare is affected by that of their spouse or---frequently---their children. What happens to their neighborhood, city or country often dramatically affects their own status. In other words, since we cannot live alone, our individuality is inevitably constrained by the conduct of others with whom we choose---or are compelled---to associate. Of course, students receive no more individualized treatment than adults. They are coerced into schools, assigned to grades, compelled to stay with their families, required to study, and so on. The only essential difference between the way students and adults are treated is that our treatment of the young is often surrounded with more cant and dishonesty. And, if we play down this often dishonest theme of individualization and frankly talk about community and general obligation to others, we are then treating the young more like adults, and thus assisting their emotional maturation.

It may also be contended that contemporary students are too 'mature' to accept these constraints; they could only be applied to less sophisticated (i.e., traditional?) adolescents. I agree that there may be more difficulty in applying such demands to contemporary students---though, in many institutions, contemporary faculty will be more resistent to applying constraints than the students will be to accepting them. But I do not view modern students as especially 'mature'. Their vocabularies and skills in dealing with abstractions may tend to be greater, but this is cognitive knowledge. The word 'maturity' is popularly used to refer to emotional balance: the ability to make and keep commitments, to accept the demands of community life, to resist destructive 'temptations,' to tactfully but firmly defend one's rights, to make

judicious important choices and so on. The available data demonstrates, through a great variety of objective measures, that contemporary adolescents are displaying less emotional stability than the equivalent cohorts of fifteen and twenty-five years ago. They are more prone to suicide, violent crimes, venereal disease, illegitimacy, alcoholism and drug use. Such conduct represents immaturity. Of course, immature students will have greater difficulty in accepting reasonable constraints than will mature students: but we should not further complicate the matter by mislabelling such resistance 'maturity'.

Some mention should also be made of the relationship between the institution and the students' parents---after all, very few of the students will earn most of their costs themselves. Realistically, the form of institution I have proposed should increase the willingness of many parents to pay the high costs involved. The institution promises to provide their children with something unique for their money. And something many upper-middle class parents value. So, while the institution may turn-off some relatively immature young people, it may actually increase the willingness of some parents to pay college cost. Of course, some young people may be offended at the implicit underlining of their dependency which is suggested by the 'pitch.' But, once again, maturity is the ability to live with facts. College students whose education is largely financed by their parents are extremely dependent. While their faces should not be rubbed-in this reality, it also should not be denied, or masked. Such a masking is a pretense that panders to immaturity.

My concluding substantive point would be to re-emphasize that the unique elements of the college structure must be clearly presented in advance of enrollment. The rules, commitment structure, grading, rating and testing systems, and the group participation requirements must all be explained generally. And, naturally, the college may want to accompany the explanation with a statement about how and why such policies are equated with expecting and supporting student emotional maturity.

The hypothetical early college I have just portrayed would be a social system that produced significant constructive effects on its students. Those effects would be reflected in an increase in the proportion of emotionally mature students enrolling in and graduating from the college. This increase would enable the college to be greater service to its immediate constituency, and to provide a model of academic excellence which might be of great value to American higher education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Some writings that provide a historical and sociological backdrop for the general propositions presented in the text.

Aries, Phillipe, **Centuries of Childhood** (New York: Knopf, 1962). A basic work presenting data about the accelerated maturation processes prevailing in pre-modern Europe.

Berg, Jan Hendrick van den, **The Changing Nature of Man** (New York: Norton, 1961). The author argues that the emotional nature of Western man---especially the nature of the young---has significantly changed as a result of shifting social forces.

Coleman, James S., et al., **Youth: Transition to Adulthood** (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974). Also indexed as 'President's Scientific Advisory Committee Report.' A series of papers outlining many of the processes that increasingly isolated American youth from adult life and maturing experiences.

Handlin, Oscar and Mary F., **Facing Life** (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971). A series of sketches of typical life experiences of youths of earlier American periods.

Heath, Douglas, **Growing Up In College** (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968). A description and analysis of the trends affecting student life and learning in a small private college. A powerful critique of excessive individualism.

Kanter, Rosabeth, **Commitment And Community** (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972). A study of nineteenth and twentieth century utopian communities, and an analysis of the factors associated with their persistence or speedy dissolution.

Katz, Eli, **Armed Love** (New York: Bantam, 1973). A well-written reporter's description of life in a number of communes, demonstrating the destructive potential of such directionless environments.

Wilkinson, Rupert, ed., **Gentlemanly Power** (London: Oxford University Press, 1964). A history and analysis of the character-shaping forces used by the British public schools, especially during the nineteenth century.

Wynne, Edward A., **Growing-Up Suburban** (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1977). An analysis (and a prescription) of the maturation problems confronting modern youth. Includes a great deal of data about youth alienation.

Wynne, Edward A., 'Teaching About Cooperation and Competition,' **The Educational Forum**, XL, No. 3 (March, 1976), pp. 279-288. Describes the operation of a novel grading system that encourages student cooperative learning.

THE EARLY COLLEGE: EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR GROWTH INTO FREEDOM

Frederick Ferré

This Consultation provides an opportunity for thinking our way back to the basics. What, if anything, justifies the existence of an early college? What, for that matter, justifies collegiate education of any kind? Is there any special mission for an early college? If so, are there specific educational tactics that may be especially well suited for the carrying out of that mission? And what larger implications for the more traditional educational institutions may be drawn from answers we may hope to find for these fundamental questions?

No such answers will be possible without some strategic framework. We had better be clear, first, about what our enterprise is aimed at. Then we may assess concrete tactical proposals with greater assurance. And finally we may be emboldened to give the rest of the educational world some advice.

I

If we are really going all the way back to basics in establishing our strategic framework, then I may be permitted to begin with a few remarks about human freedom. These are views that I must not pause to develop or defend in any detail (I have done this elsewhere[1]), but I must lay them down, at least, so that the foundations of my approach to education may be exposed for all to see, for better or for worse. Bluntly, I believe that education is for the sake of enhancing human freedom---expanding our range of real possibility for doing and being---and, correspondingly, I believe that human freedom is something that can grow or shrink and that real possibilities can be added to or subtracted from human lives in many ways.

To take an obvious example, it may not be a real possibility for me now to perform a hundred push-ups within ten minutes. But this is not a fixed fact about me. Given sufficient determination and enough time to get back into training, I could reshape the constraining boundaries of real possibility and eventually add this ability back to my repertoire. I could, that is, all other things being equal. But if both my arms had to be amputated at the shoulders, then not only my performing push-ups but also many other present real possibilities would be simultaneously cut off.

Human freedom, I am saying, is always circumscribed by conditions. Some of these conditions are bodily. They are usually the obvious ones. But some of the conditions that bear on our freedom to do and to be are more subtle and reflect the state of our minds or consciousness. Human language, taken broadly to include all types of symbol systems, is immensely powerful in contributing to our range of

[1]Frederick Ferré, 'Self-Determinism,' **The American Philosophical Quarterly**, Vol. 10, No. 3, July 1973, pp. 165-176.

possibilities not only because it allows us to take into account matters that are not present to immediate experience but also because it helps us relate to experience itself in systematic, transpersonal, and powerfully discriminating ways. Acquiring and refining linguistic skills, therefore, is of enormous consequence for our level of freedom. Mentally handicapped persons who remain in a pre-linguistic infantile state of development have a pitifully small range of real possibilities open to them, however well-developed their bodies may become.

The real range of freedom of people to be and to do, then, expands with normal human development from infancy through youth and into maturity; it is enhanced by the cultivation of consciousness and nurture of physical capacities; it is a function of the variety of alternatives from which our actual determinations are drawn. Human freedom is always limited: by history and geography, by genetic endowment and environmental constraints; by the inevitability of old age and death; by the quality and quantity of past experience; by the conceptual structures through which experience is handled; and by the effects of past choices on where and who we are today. But human freedom is never fixed. Capacities left unused will atrophy; even to keep freedoms once won demands constant struggle against decay. Still, there are always more real creative possibilities than there are actualities of achievement. And it is from this infinitely rich metaphysical state of affairs that education receives its challenge, its hope, and its never-exhausted agenda.

That agenda, seen at its fullest, involves nothing less than leading out the whole individual---body, mind, and emotions---from the relatively bounded to the relatively free. This means not only concern for the expansion of consciousness but also the provison of means for its disciplined self-development; and this means, further, not only helping the individual self to grow into freedom but also luring the individual out of limiting isolation into the mutually enriching context of human community.

Education, that is, needs to be holistic at its best if it is to function properly in enhancing human freedom. On the one hand, the whole person is at stake. The health of the body and the alertness of the mind are intertwined in complex ways. On the other hand, the individual self is not fully whole without human society, as well, which nurtures each of us through out relatively helpless immaturity and provides consciousness with common language. Different educational tasks will require different emphases, no doubt, but all education is dealing, inevitably, with entire human beings. As complex organized selves made up of our bodies, ambitions, values, fears, prejudices, habits, moralities, beliefs, aversions, and relationships to others, we find that our freedoms to do and to be are achieved in us as we are---differentiated organic unities---or not at all. This educational imperative to holism is, of course, grounded in one basic fact about life: that healthy living organisms are integrated entities, which means that influences on one part of such an entity will have vital repercussions throughout.

A similar rooting in another basic fact about life warrants the hope of educators that new possibilities can indeed be nurtured: this is the fact that life is enormously creative. There is something about life that presses against old impossibilities and refuses to take them as final. At one time life outside the sea was a flat impossibility;

but novelties emerged and creative organisms equipped with new capacities won the land for life. Similarly, burgeoning life forms have taken to the arctic, to the desert, to the air, and even---most recently through the instrumentality of human thought and technique---to outer space itself. We human organisms find within ourselves, perhaps preeminently, the creative throb that divides the living from the dead and defies final definition in terms of past achievements. Life's amazing capacity for transcending given actuality is the creative thrust that education serves.

Holism and creativity are two of the fundamental facts about life that properly underlie our basic vision of the larger educational enterprise, but these must be joined by one more before the picture can be complete. Living forms innovate, but not without structure; they grow, but not without limit. Homeostasis, the capacity for balance and internal constraint, is the dialectical partner of creativity, without which life would destroy itself in a blooming anarchy of excess. Holistic relations within organisms, and among organisms, carry on the homeostatic task of keeping creativity from becoming mere exuberant formlessness. Educators serve creativity best, therefore, when they help new possibilities to take shape in structured ways that enhance the zest of holistic growth. Discipline need not be the enemy of delight; it is, rather, its needed partner, giving structure and staying power through internal constraint.

If this is the case, all of education fits into the enterprise of human life as the ordered stimulus toward creative possibilities for whole persons. Elementary education enhances possibilities by perpetuating basic cultural skills and knowledge so that creative advances of the past need not be lost, and so that new individuals may share in the experiences of the larger human community of which they are, and need to be, members. Advanced technical education, for its part, enhances the freedom of persons to do what would otherwise be impossible tasks. But central to the living quest for larger possibilities for being as well as doing, and thus central to all education's aim to enhance human freedom, stands that form of leading out that assumes the basic cultural forms and moves from them to new discoveries about what it means to be human, to be alive in a world surrounded by life, and to be larger than any role or skill.

That form of leading out toward new freedoms to be is what we have traditionally called liberal education. And if my vision of the human condition and the place of education in it is even minimally correct, then the continued importance of the college of liberal arts as a stimulus and a vehicle for the human spirit is assured. This does not mean, of course, that actual colleges of liberal arts are assured of peaceful prosperity in their present forms, or even of survival. What it does imply, I think, is that there is a permanent need in human life for what the colleges of higher liberal learning have beeen attempting in their relatively limited range of ways to provide: organized opportunities for enhanced personal freedom to understand, to enjoy, to aspire, and to be.

Unfortunately, liberal education has tended to become identified with the small set of ways in which the colleges have traditionally presented these opportunities. Creativity, we have seen, requires homeostatic discipline to prevent its dissipation

into formlessness; but there is no eternal law requiring that this discipline be expressed only and always through 'the disciplines' that educators have defined in part from good methodological tradition and in part from professional convenience or power politics. Other meaningful ways of structuring experience and reflection are possible and may be at least as enhancing to the freedoms of understanding, enjoyment, aspiration, and being as any of the old ways. Likewise, higher liberal learning must presuppose an adequate baseis in common conceptual skills and general knowledge before it may begin to lead further along the paths of possibilities., but this presupposition has no necessary connection with any specific calendar age or school credential.

The liberal studies of intrinsic worth, of course, are not the only legitimate or important kind of education. On the contrary, as I have already pointed out, basic education is vital to the creative continuance of human culture as well as a prerequisite for higher education. And professional or technical education is needed, at least for some members of that culture, to open possibilities of skills and roles that would otherwise remain outside the range of human doing. A person awakened to new possibilities of aspiring, enjoying, and being may very well wish also to add possibilities of doing which only further specialized training will create. But such a person will never confuse the self with the role, or suppose that one's being is exhausted by one's doing. In the last analysis all such doing is for the sake of the larger and deeper freedoms of being.

Especially at the current historical moment, when the likelihood of unprecedently large changes in our civilization is immense and urgent, there is a vital need for individuals to have cultivated their freedoms of understanding, enjoyment, aspiration, and personal being with greater independence than usual from the traditional roles and skills that our energy-intensive modern world has tended to emphasize. Even in stable times it is a painful cheat to suppose that an occupational role can supply full self-identity. Vocation should follow from humanistic self-discovery rather than taking its place. But supremely in times when all roles are likely to be in question and when large social adjustments are sure to be needed, the full freedoms of liberal learning are the pressing order of the day. This is the living context within which our Consultation on the early college is taking place. What follows when this context is seriously accepted?

II

Supposing that our strategic educational aim is the enhancement of intrinsically valuable freedoms in whole human organisms through the disciplined nurturing of creative possibilities, and supposing, further, that we wish to direct this aim toward a group of young people who are ready with the basics of common skills and knowledge earlier than the average for our society, what tactics should we use? This will be the practical issue facing any early college and, concretely, it is the issue facing Simon's Rock Early College as that nontraditional institution constantly reassesses the process for which it was founded and in which it is deeply engaged. My reflections have led me to draw tactical conclusions in four major realms pertinent to education's strategic aims. These involve suggestions regarding student

life, the curriculum, the faculty, and the institutional structure at an early college.

A. **Student Life**. Liberal education means a leading out into freedom for the whole person: Mind, body, and emotions. Holistic education will be properly concerned to enhance the possibilities of growth into freedom, therefore, in the entire life process of those for whom it is concerned. We are not compartmentalized filing cabinets; we are complex living organisms so related internally and to one another that every change in a part affects the whole, and the condition of the whole affects each part.

This is why the quality of student life at any college, and most unmistakably at an early college, is vital to the entire collegiate enterprise. The very youth of collegians in their middle teens underscores the need for attention to aspects of their growth into freedom that might escape attention otherwise. The bodies of people who are fifteen, sixteen, and seventeen years old are still rapidly changing. There is the need to come to terms with powerful sexual drives attendant upon maturation. Human sexuality is a challenge both to self-understanding and to creating modes of relating to other persons of both sexes. Unlike the reproductive processes of animals, human sexuality is laden with moral, aesthetic, and religious value. Decisions made and patterns formed in the early or mid teens may liberate or imprison, fulfill or stunt, a major dimension of human expression. Therefore an early college committed to educational holism will make means available for the enlargement and adornment of human life through sexual maturation. Given leadership that is itself mature, and enough unblushing attention through the wide variety of facilities at a college---ranging from health service information and support, through curricular contributions from literature, anthropology, philosophy, psychology, and religion, to personal counselling and sensitively trained dormitory leadership---it might be hoped that sex itself could become a lifelong liberal art rather than a smutty process furtively engaged in in semi-human modes. An early college is at least a good place to work toward such personally liberating goals.

Another dimension of student life in which a holistic educational concern will be expressed is with the struggle of people in their mid-teens to establish their own identity in contrast to parents, peers, and authority in general. Experimentation with independence should be nurtured and helped to gain structure, coherence, and responsibility. Autonomy, to be genuine, needs accountability as surely as creativity requires homeostasis.

This means that student life must be left with sufficient flexibility so that growth towards responsible autonomy can quickly be answered with the transfer of real areas of control to students. But it does not mean automatic *laisser faire* under all circumstances or capitualtion to the lowest common demand. Education aims to enhance possibilities, not to settle for actualities. It is either a leading out to fuller freedoms of enjoyment and aspiration or it is untrue to its own central task.

In all this there are two dialectics at work which educators must notice and nurture. One is the dialectic between the achieved and the achievable. Values achieved, however limited, must not be scorned. They are to be celebrated as the

latest manifestation of creativity under control. But they are neither to be worshipped as final ends nor rested upon. They are the new actual foothold from which still newer ranges of possibilities may be reached. Thus each achievement is valued both for itself and as a means to something more. Neither, for a wise educator, will be allowed to detract from the other. Similarly, the second dialectic ranges between the individual and society. One's identity is in tension with the identity of others who may absorb, distort, or blur the person one is, but one could never define oneself at all without the other. One's independence, too, is to be established in contrast to others. An early college should give conscious attention to assisting its students to find independence not only from the parental world but also from the potentially all-absorbing pressures from peers. Social alternative, escape routes from the enslavements of majority mores, as well as curricular emphasis on independent studies, should be prominently featured. But healthy independence does not mean cranky isolation either from the social world or the realm of scholarship. Social like scholarly independence entails relating to soceity in a new, positive way. Independence, identity, and community require one another. At an early college where these issues are unusually pressing it is vital---and perhaps more feasible---that this great human dialectic be thoroughly learned.

B. **The Curriculum.** I have already twice mentioned the curriculum in my discussion of student life. This is as it should be. We may talk about them separately, but in reality they must not be disjoined. Developing freedoms of understanding should be a leading part of the life experienced by students at an early college; and, *vice versa*, the academic life of the mind should be designed to illuminate the whole of a student's existence. This is why the curricular study of human sexuality in its biological, sociological, historical, ethical, aesthetic, and religious aspects (as suggested in my earlier example) is entirely fitting for an age group coming vividly to terms with personal sexual imperatives. This is why (to recall my second example) curricular emphasis on independent studies is particularly appropriate for students who are struggling throughout their lives to discover personal identity and to express personal independence in constructive, responsible ways.

Such holism---emphasizing the zestful role of the intellect within full human life will be a key tactic in achieving one of the fundamental strategic aims of education: to cultivate in each life a deep and statisfying love of learning, a respect for intelligence, and a taste for creative fulfillments that would not have been real possibilities without its leading. The satisfactions of research, the triumphs of creative achievement, need conscious cultivation throughout the curriculum and the college. This has implications for the kind of faculty to be sought, of course, and for the priorities of the institution as a whole. To anticipate one word concerning the latter, I should think that the symbolism for the college of its library and its hours of being open would be crucial in any statement of its real priorities. A library locked up on weekends or at the hour that the dormitory parties begin does not bespeak passionate commitment to the joys of the mind.

Creative zest and holism alone, of course, are not enough. As we saw earlier, form and structure are required in any curriculum that would avoid dissipation into

triviality. Precisely what this entails for a given curriculum probably ought not to be specified in the abstract, apart from the specific abilities and fascinations of the faculty who will develop and teach it. Some faculties will opt for the traditional ways of integrating learning, through the time-honed and time-honored disciplines which they have been taught at graduate school. Others may experiment with alternative ways of supplying structure and integrity to the life of the mind. At an early college I personally would lean toward the latter, since the opportunity for creating non-traditional approaches is too rare and precious to be lightly foregone. Perhaps a mixture of some traditional and some novel methods of structuring integrated understanding could coexist at such a college.

At any rate, at least four distinct but interrelated foci must be part of any responsible curriculum. First, there must be a focus on conceptual forms, and on helping the students cultivate the conceptual capacities that enhance human powers and undergird all other distinctively human freedoms. This focus would include mathematics, rhetoric, and logic as well as all languages, both native and foreign. It is the master key to all the others. The second focus must be on factual content, not only filling the conceptual categories with the best that is known from the natural and social sciences but, even more important, showing how factual knowledge can be acquired, tested, discarded, or adopted by thoughtful citizens of the intellectual world. A third focus needs to be on cultivating possibilities of enjoyment and evaluation. This should not only be appreciative, as in learning to listen and look at musical and visual arts, but also creative, as in performance and poetry writing and painting. In this curricular focus each student should learn neither to fear nor to despise value judgments. They are the essence of the humanities. Finally, the fourth essential focus in a liberal education is the one that attempts to put all the rest together according to intelligible principles of organization. This will involve helping the student to develop capacities in the reflective disciplines of philosophy and history and religion.

All four of these are vital to a liberated mind. Without conceptual powers the mind is helpless. Without reliable factual knowledge, the mind is adrift from reality. Without capacity for intelligent value judgments, the mind is without meaning. And without coherent patterns of synthesis, the mind if fragmented and torn.

What is not vital, however, especially at an early college, is vocational or occupational training. The current rage for giving a career twist to the curriculum in order to enhance marketability for liberal arts students must be strongly resisted. If ever there is an opportunity for a pure celebration of the enhancement of human freedom made possible through higher liberal learning, it is in an early college. There, if anywhere, is the place where extra time is available, before the pressures of career choice and the exigencies of the market place call for specialized narrowing toward social roles and economic skills. It may be tempting for an early college to recruit students (or, more likely, to persuade students' parents) with the vision of their 'beating out the market' for professional places before their traditional contemporaries are ready to compete for places. But that would be wrong. When an early college graduate enters the job market, competition is not avoided; he or she is simply competing with an older crowd. The right reason for cutting high school short and engaging in liberal learning early, rather, is to maximize the opportunity for

growth toward freedom. Premature channeling into narrower purposes would be a tragic distortion of what the early college is primarily about.

C. **The Faculty**. In view of all this, certain conclusions follow about the sort of faculty needed at an early college. They should first of all be in sympathy with the fundamental aims of liberal learning. Unfortunately, this is not universally the case even at liberal arts institutions. There is a fashionable cynicism at large whose roots are in the materialist value assumptions of our commericial culture and whose influence is straightened by a dangerous short-sightedness about the large changes looming in the years ahead. Faculty members are not immune to this infection, but one might hope that an early college, founded to promote growth toward freedom, might attract only those who genuinely share the values of the liberated mind.

Second, the faculty at an early college should themselves share the love of learning, the incomparable delight in the joys of intelligence, that it is the hope of the college to instill in its students. Research, creative production or performance, intellectual scrupulousness, and cultivated enjoyments should be a natural and necessary part of every faculty members life. I am not arguing for a 'publish or perish' policy to be imposed from outside a faculty member's own normal motivations. I am merely urging that love of learning and engagement with the scholarly, artistic, and scientific world ought to begin with the faculty as a matter of course.

This will require that faculty members themselves have mastered fully the arts and methods of scholarly research. That usually entails the possession of the terminal degree in the pertinent field, though the worship of the Ph.D. is a form of idolatry I do not wish to advocate. Indeed, there are certain disadvantages to hiring with a too fervent concentration on the Ph.D. if a nontraditional variety of ways of integrating learning is to be hoped for. The same process that helps graduate students master the techniques of high-level scholarly research often indoctrinates them so strongly into the traditional disciplinary approaches that they become unable to imagine, or even to be interested in conceiving, any alternative modes of organizing human experience and thought. There is no need to disparage the traditional disciplines, as I argued earlier; but it would be interesting at an early college to experiment with other means to the same educational end. Perhaps a happy combination of research capacity and open-mindedness might come from seeking some faculty who have graduated from programs where well-designed doctoral degrees are provided in interdisciplinary studies.

The greatest difficulty that arises from selecting faculty exclusively on the basis of their research degreees, however, is the key problem for an early college: research degrees alone do not guarantee a capacity for---or even an interest in---teaching human beings who require leading out to new possibilities. At no college should teaching be taken for granted, but at an early college where values are in transition and where personal identities are being formed, the professor must not expect simply to profess a subject but also to help whole persons to learn it and much else besides. If a faculty member is not equipped to perform this function, or if that faculty member's value scheme disparages concern for whole persons---bodies, minds, and emotions---as 'nursemaid' functions, then clearly an early college is the

wrong professional location. What an early college needs is a faculty made up of mature, integrated persons who are scholars and teachers in the fullest sense. The early college needs not merely Ph.D.s, but 'Ph.D.s-**plus**.'

This can hardly be expected, however, of a faculty that is overworked and under rewarded. With the best will in the world, faculty who must carry an excessive teaching load will not have enough energy to carry out their own collegiate research or creative activities. And faculty who may wish to become effective teachers may need help, through faculty development efforts sponsored by the college, to learn more about teaching persons in the mid-teen years. Similarly, faculty eager to work out new ways of integrating the curriculum need support from the institution for such efforts. If the college holds up high expectations for its faculty, as it must, so likewise may the faculty raise its expectations in return.

D. **The Institution**. This mention of institutional support for faculty illustrates again how inseparably intertwined all these topics are. In the end, it is up to the institution to make quality student life possible by supplying adequate health and recreational facilitites, strong leadership for out of class educational pursuits, competent counsellors, liveable dormitories, and the like. In the same way, it is for the institution to encourage the best possible curriculum and support facilities, including long hours for the library, plenty of books, equipment, classroom space, and so on. Moreover, institutional policies regarding faculty hiring and development, as we have just seen, are crucial. These matters we may now take for granted; I have other things to discuss.

First, I would like to recommend that any early college be careful to remain in human scale. By this I do not mean that an early college, by its mission and nature, needs to remain as small as Simon's Rock Early College is today. On the contrary, I suspect that Simon's Rock is a bit too small for optimum educational quality. But I no longer believe, as I was once tempted to, that smallness is an accidental quality of an early college. The principle of homeostasis, of internally imposed limits on imbalances of hormones or of body temperature or of growth, reminds us that proportions matter.

The proportions of an early college must remain on the smaller side---perhaps 500 to 750 students at maximum---because of its essential commitment to holism in education. The whole person matters at an early college; and if a person matters as a whole then he or she requires a human context where recognition as a whole individual is possible. Numbers, up to a point, bring added efficiencies, but with them, inevitably, impersonality. An impersonal early college would, in my judgment, be a contradiction in terms. Therefore growth should be kept in hand.

At the same time, however, an early college must take special steps to remain fully connected to the rest of the world and to fellow institutions of higher learning. Because an early college should remain small, it may have a tendency to become excessively ingrown. Human scale should make for individual recognition; human scale should promote concerned community. But small is not always beautiful. Human scale must not result in pettiness, provincialism, or incestuous self-absorption. These are temptations to beware of and to take precautions against.

Some interconnections will just happen; others need to be woven. I suggest that some way be found to promote student exchanges between an early college and traditional colleges. Some of these exchanges may be very short-term, such as weekend activities. If a visiting poet is available, for example, let the literary clubs at nearby institutions hear about it and invite a limited number to the reception and to overnight accommodations. Soon something reciprocal may be begun. On a longer term, semester exchanges might be negotiated with interested colleges having different background, ethnic mixtures, or locations. Still other students should plan years off, studying abroad, perhaps, or experiencing a contrasting type of institution. Everyone at an early college, after all, is ahead of the game. Time should be something to relax about. Even if a semester or a year needs to be left officially uncredited because of some worthwhile experience off-campus, no matter. Richness and variety are treasures worth pausing for. Who's racing, anyway?

Another set of interconnections that needs thoughtful weaving is between the faculty at an early college and other members of the profession at large. Early college professors have a special additional responsibility to teaching set by the nontraditional age group they deal with, but they must not allow themselves to feel alienated from their colleagues. All are college professors together. Membership in scholarly societies, full participation in professional associations like the American Association for University Professors, and regular publication in or correspondence with the journals of the disciplines will sustain the awareness of the larger scholarly world beyond the borders of the early college. Leaves of absence and sabbatical leaves should also be used to tighten the threads of professional involvement as well as to foster personal research.

Finally, a small early college should work to weave connections between its curriculum and full life experience both on an off the campus. I have already urged the considered interplay between student life and study, between work and leisure. In addition, and farther afield, the institution should provide opportunities to experience in the larger world those aspects of life with which the curriculum is dealing. If a hostel could be established in a major city, students of political science might live there one week to immerse themselves in the political bustle or in court proceedings. Another week could see the arrival of music students to attend a series of concerts or, perhaps, to observe the rehearsals of a great orchestra. Still other weeks could be devoted to activities in the arts or in theatre or in economics or in journalism or in any of a multitude of domains correlated with college study. A different sort of opportunities might include semester-long internships in selected activities set in surroundings that contrasted with the home campus. The means are endless; the important end is full and fruitful intercourse between the early college as a small community of liberal learning and the rest of life for which growth into freedom is intended.

III

I began with overall strategies, then moved to tactics, and then, briefly, to quite specific suggestions. It is time to step back, once more, to survey the larger picture

and to see whether what I have sketched on behalf of the early college concept contains any useful messages for the educational establishment as a whole. Does the idea of the early college contain any lessons for higher education generally?

I think that there are several such lessons. One of them is a generalization from the very attempt to provide an alternative to the standard collegiate rhythms: namely, the **importance of pluralism in educational opportunities**. The early college challenges the dominance of habit, the unexamined sway of the status quo. It does not argue that all colleges should aim at the sixteen to eighteen year old population. It recognizes that its mission is a specialized one and that it will never be a majority leader. But by existing, the early college reminds the educational establishment that there ought to be a number of legitimate routes open to the ends of higher education. In so doing the early college concept serves to expand educational consciousness as it challenges the complacency of routine expectations.

Second, the concept of the early college stands strongly for **education as something deeply involving the whole person.** There is no overlooking the fact that college students in their mid-teens are not disembodied intellects. The same is true of all students, but sometimes it is fashionable in certain educational circles---and certainly it is easier when dealing with older persons---to ignore this fact. Such a fashion, however prestigious, however, is harmful to the full educational ideal. The early college therefore stands as a symbol of conscience to educators and educational institutions tempted to shirk or deny their total task.

Related to the second is a third general lesson: education to be holistic and humanly fulfilling **needs to be maintained within a human scale.** There is a tendency toward sheer growth in all organisms and institutions. Educational institutions are no exception, and apparent institutional efficiencies to be gained from increase in size are hard to resist. Coupled with this is the fact that there are real educational virtues in assembling scholars in sufficient numbers so that their interactions---on the metaphor of 'critical mass' in nuclear reactions---may set off an intellectual ferment that none in isolation could approach. Still, however, there is the balancing need in healthy organisms and institutions for homeostatic restraint against gigantism and deformity. The early college, because of its special mission, may reach those internal limits before some other types of college in a pluralistic educational world, and this is as it should be. But the early college reminds the rest of its diverse brethren that the problem of scale is a vital one. Perhaps it may be creatively met, as at Oxford or at Santa Cruz, by nurturing colleges within the university as units of human scale and significance. Perhaps, alternatively, it may be solved by establishing consortia among colleges to share in certain efficiencies and in intellectual stimulation while retaining appropriate internal limits to growth. However it is done, the early college stands as a reminder that it must be done with sensitivity and alertness to the conditions under which human persons can best relate to one another and grow in their own powers of determination and fulfillment.

A fourth lesson to be drawn from the early college is not easily heard in a time of vocational preoccupation: it is the **continued importance of the liberal arts in higher education.** The arguments for the cultivation of the intrinsically valuable powers of

appreciation, understanding, and creativity---the freedoms of being---are compelling not only in connection with the early college, on which we have been focusing, but draw their power from the needs of human beings generally. Therefore they illuminate the responsibilities of education devoted to persons at any age. This does not take away any of the value from specialized professional or vocational training. The freedoms of doing are also important for whole persons. But the early college, ideally situated to provide a paradigm of personally fulfilling liberal learning, unencumbered by the hurry to specialize and undistorted by the demands of the marketplace, remains a beacon of encouragement to the liberal arts everywhere.

A fifth lesson emerging from the freedom of the early college to present its liberating arts in nontraditional ways is the **multiplicity of legitimate ways to achieve integration in learning.** The traditional disciplines offer one established way of bringing rigor and method to the experience of learning. But there are other routes, as well, to the same end. Indeed, better ways may be devised, I think, than reliance upon the traditional curriculum that sunders understanding and fosters tunnel vision at the same time that it contributes method and rigor. The zest of young minds to see new connections in order to experience the world whole is a special challenge to faculty at an early college to experiment creatively with new ways of disciplining old materials in the search for new coherences. And in this creative quest the early college calls other educators to similar freshness of curricular vision.

Finally, there is a lesson for the whole of higher education that comes from the very heart of the early college concept: that in our time of historical transition, especially, our **society dare not waste the precious resource represented by its younger members.** The young have the power to see things differently from those who are established in inherited patterns of thought and perception. Usually, alas, those powers of fresh vision are wasted from lack of rigorous cultivation and are cramped by the prison walls of ignorance. At the early college, however, youth is given its due respect. The minds of the young are cared for enough to be honed to a finer edge sooner than has been society's habit. And at the same time those minds are urged to be fully themselves: to see with growing discrimination what they see; to express with growing precision what they think; to contribute with growing maturity what they uniquely can to shape our future in needed ways.

At the early college youth is a source of proper pride. Being younger does not mean 'already being there,' of course; but it means that the younger person is in a period of intense and rapid change. Body, mind, and emotions are all vibrantly alive and yearning for growth into new freedoms that will flower into personal and social fulfillments of the deepest sort. Just as colleges in general are society's organs for enhancing human freedoms through expanding awareness, so the early college is society's organ for intensifying disciplined freshness within that expanded awareness. In that precarious role the early college lives out its gadfly existence, and in meeting that stimulating, life-affirming function it earns its place in the sun.

BREAKING THE EDUCATIONAL LOCKSTEP: THE SIMON'S ROCK EXPERIENCE

Nancy R. Goldberger

ABSTRACT

The orderly progression through twelve years of elementary and secondary school is not only the norm for American youth but a presumed prerequisite for entering the realm of conceptual thought and mature self-determination expected of college students. The concept of early college challenges this assumption on grounds that some young people are motivated and academically able to make the high school to college shift after only two or three years of secondary school. This paper deals with the concept of early college as it has been implemented at Simon's Rock, the only college in the U. S. specifically designed for the 16 to 20 year old age group. Based on a four-year longitudinal study of students at Simon's Rock, the discussion focuses on the developmental characteristics and needs of mid-adolescents in college. Special attention is given the issue of intellectual versus psychological readiness for college in the attempt to answer the question of 'What kind of student should go to college early?'

BREAKING THE EDUCATIONAL LOCKSTEP: THE SIMON'S ROCK EXPERIENCE

In the late 1960's and early 1970's the American educational system came under attack as inadequately providing for the needs of our country's mid-adolescents. Students began to accuse the educational establishment of wasting their time and talents and of underestimating their ability to think about the real world. Increasing drop-out rates and a new tendency to avoid college altogether highlighted the seriousness of the students' charges against our secondary and post-secondary schools. In the years since the alarm was first sounded, the students' cry for relevance and meaning in their education has had the effect of altering the curriculum in many high schools and colleges. Secondary schools have tried to satisfy their students' need to expand beyond the traditional high school curriculum by introducing collegiate-level courses or by allowing students to gain credits in nearby colleges. Colleges have recognized the need to attend to the development of the 'whole person' by paying more attention to out-of-the-classroom growth experiences and to those processes by which the student evolves a system of values and life goals. Curricular innovations notwithstanding, little real attention has been given to the kinds of **structural** changes in our educational system that might help to deal with the mid-adolescent complaints of boredom, alienation, passivity, and adult condescension. The wisdom of the traditional structure, that is, the educational lockstep of 8 years elementary, 4 years high school, 4 years college, and on into the

*The research on which this article is based was funded by grants from the Carnegie Foundation and the National Science Foundation (Grant #EPP74-15036).

nether reaches of post-collegiate education, has not been broadly questioned in educational circles in spite of the obvious and increasing popularity among students of early college admissions and advanced placement programs. With few exceptions, colleges and universities pay little attention to the problems of articulation between high school and college. On the contrary, according to a report on early education by the New York Times[1], educators at both the high school and college level are often more concerned about the economic and social implications of tampering with the traditional academic structure than they are eager to consider the possible benefits.

Challenging the educational status quo and the sanctity of the high school diploma may not be everyone's solution to the problems of American adolescents, but it was the founding philosophy on which Simon's Rock Early College was based. What follows is a report on a four-year study of the early college concept as it has been implemented at the only existing college which is devoted exclusively to the liberal education of the 16 to 20 year old age group.

Background of the Early College Concept

The recognition that some young people are ready for college level work before reaching the age of eighteen is not a new one. In the United States, from the days of Hutchins' pioneering venture at the University of Chicago to current day proliferation of early admissions programs and such special efforts as the Gifted Students Program at Johns Hopkins, opportunities have existed for a few select students to enter college early. Historically in most Western countries, students have been admitted to the university at a relatively young age compared with their American counterparts whose adolescence is prolonged[2,3] and who spend the 'best' of their teen-age years in junior and senior high schools. For most American parents and teachers, the orderly progression through the twelve years of elementary and secondary school is not only the norm for young people but an unquestionably valid prerequisite for entering the realm of conceptual thought and mature self-determination expected of college students. However, developmentalists and educators have noted that young people reach social and intellectual maturity earlier and come to college with more knowledge than did students in the past. Large numbers of students every year regularly take the College Board's Advanced Placement Program in the 11th and 12th grade. According to the test scores, these students are as fully prepared for college as secondary school graduates. As stated in the CEEB study **16 to 20: The Liberal Education of an Age Group,**[4] [secondary] schools appear to hold on to their older students far too hard, to fail to recognize the essential difference between the large children in their ninth and tenth grades and the young adults, physically mature and eager to test their wings, in grades 11 and 12.' The study indicted our educational system as sustaining the existing structures which are inadequate for the period of growth and transition known as mid-adolescence and recommend the development of middle or early college options for those students who are ready to make the shift. Another important study of higher education, **Less Time, More Options**[5] published by the Carnegie Commission in the early 1970's, also made the point that young people, jobs, and life-styles have changed and, from this premise, propose modifications in the structure of postsecondary education: provide more options and shorten the

63

length of time in formal education. The study claims that there is considerable redundancy in the high school and college curriculum and that the eight years spent moving through this curriculum could be reduced by roughly one-fourth without sacrificing educational quality. The influential 1971 White House Conference on Youth and President's Science Advisory Committee headed by James Coleman[6,7] underlined the manner in which our society and educational system delays the entry of young people into adulthood. These studies then, along with the contributions of innovative individuals such as Chicago's Hutchins[8] and Elizabeth Hall, the founder of Simon's Rock[9], represent the seminal thought behind the concept of the early college. Few institutions, however, have attempted to put this concept into practice. One of the reasons has been the reservations of parents and educators about the psychological readiness of the 10th and 11th grader for college life.

The Question of Academic versus Emotional Readiness

One of the most frequently mentioned issues in discussing mid-adolescence is a commonly observed lag of emotional behind intellectual development. Peter Blos in his writing on adolescent development[10] has discussed mid-adolescence as a period when individuals may have developed mature mental processes but not yet organized egos or distinct life plans. The relative smoothness of development across intellectual and emotional spheres was probably an assumption in the first early admissions programs. However, since the University of Chicago days when the gifted young early-entry freshmen were brought to the urban campus and atttended classes with older students, it was noted that intellectual giftedness and facility in passing exams does not insure psychological maturity or social grace. Retrospective accounts from early college students themselves have indicated a range of adjustment problems---feelings of insecurity and loneliness, awkwardness and self-consciousness, fear of competing on a social level, and sometimes regret over having tried too much too soon. Certainly, some of these problems are what an anxious parent might anticipate in trying to decide if his child should begin college early. The attempt to integrate the younger student into the social life on a campus where he is outranked at every turn by the older students may indeed be the crux of the problem with many early admissions programs. Little is known about what contributes to successful adjustment of the younger student at college and too little attention is given anywhere to making the high school to college transition easier, for the 18 year old or the 16 year old freshman.

The authors of **16 to 20: The Liberal Education of an Age Group** argue that these ages span a natural peer group, in which individuals can benefit from life in a community separate from their families but ideally in an educational institution which does not over-estimate their commitment to specific fields or life-goals. It is at this period of their lives when young people do not want to be confined to a narrow curriculum and are easily stimulated by a liberal arts program. Mid-adolescence is the period of the emergence of formal reasoning, the ability to think about thought, and the recognition of the relativism of knowledge. It is also the period of movement away from the safety of the parental world and away from conformity to one's cultural milieu---a change which often brings pain and a sense of loss of familiar

structures. Release from the constraints of high school curricula and high school mores is what many young people want; middle schools or early colleges which have been especially designed to attend to issues of effective as well as intellectual growth may be what they need.

Simon's Rock

Simon's Rock Early College was founded in 1964 by Elizabeth Hall well before the above mentioned study commissions had made their points in the early 1970's. Mrs. Hall had recognized the need for more educational options for adolescents and strongly believed in the college's responsibility for providing an environment which promotes emotional as well as intellectual growth. Mrs. Hall stated that 'Simon's Rock conceives itself as a force for reform throughout the United States''.' The college, located in Western Massachusetts, accepts capable 10th and 11th grade students into a college liberal arts program characterized by small classes, extensive contact with faculty in and out of the classroom, and opportunities for independent work on and off campus. The college offers programs to match the different capabilities and goals of students. Many elect to enter a B.A. major and work for an A.A. degree in two or three years before transferring to another institution for a B.A. Some students transfer after only one year at Simon's Rock usually attaining sophomore standing in their new college. The academic focus at Simon's Rock is heavily interdisciplinary although curricular offerings range from the studio arts to traditional pre-medical studies.

A special 'transition year' program begins with extensive testing to get an academic and psychological profile on entering students. Freshman-level classes are constructed to promote the development of critical thinking and communication skills. A series of seminar discussions focuses on the adjustment problems in coming to college and on the mid-adolescent issues of identity and changing values. Most students live in coed dormitories along with faculty dorm directors and student resident assistants. Students have the option of becoming involved in the community governance system made up of faculty/student committees with voting rights for all committee members. A career development office supervises off-campus field work in which all students are encouraged to participate. Quality control of the academic programs is aided by the use of external examiners who make periodic visits to the campus and participate in the senior year comprehensive and thesis examinations. The size of the student body has hovered at 200 to 225 for the past five years; students from disparate parts of the United States although the bulk are from New England.

Simon's Rock seeks students whose intellectual ability and achievement and whose motivation, creativity, and potential would contribute to success in an innovative academic community. Students are assessed not only for their aptitude for college study but for evidence of serious academic interest and good reasons for wishing to enter college early. The Simon's Rock philosophy of early education emphasizes college not just for an elite group of precocious and unusually talented students but for the academically capable, motivated, and reasonably mature 16 year old.

The Evaluation of Student Characteristics and Development

For the past four years, since 1972, Simon's Rock has been engaged in a longitudinal study of incoming students and in the factors that underlie successful academic and social adjustment and performance at an early college. The focal questions for evaluation have been:

> How do Simon's Rock freshmen who are predominately 16 to 17 years old compare intellectually, in attitudes, and in psychological maturity with students who are two years older and entering the freshmen class at traditional four-year liberal arts colleges?
>
> What are the best predictors of successful academic and social adjustment at an early college?
>
> What impact does the early college experience have on individual student development?
>
> What implications do any of the findings from the evaluation study have for admissions policies, attrition, curricular and extracurricular planning, teaching strategies, and governance system?

All new students each year are given a battery of test and questionnaires to determine student characteristics at entrance. Since the entering class of 1973, almost 300 students have participated in the evaluation study. All students are tracked while at Simon's Rock, with the exception of a reluctant few, although the normal yearly attrition of approximately 40% cuts down the total pool.

The following findings and issues that have emerged in the course of the evaluation studies are discussed in the context of the theoretical perspective assumed at the outset of evaluation as well as the theoretical and practical implications that have arisen more serendipitiously.

A. Intellectual Characteristics of Incoming Students

The ability to think critically and analytically is generally recognized as an important educational objective in our society. However, it has only been recently that major national testing programs have distinguished critical thinking from verbal and quantitative abilities typically assessed in general aptitude tests and stated their intentions of including new analytic measures in the aptitude batteries, such as the Graduate Record Exam[12]. Critical thinking, as it is usually defined, is quite similar to what Piaget calls formal thought[13]: inferential reasoning, deductive logic, probabilistic and relational thought, and abstraction. In addition, the critical thinker can recognize presuppositions in arguments and distinguish relevance from irrelevance. It is safe to say that many faculty members at a college level assume that the students who reach their classroom doors are already critical thinkers; thus, able to deal with whatever level of abstraction and theory the instructor feels appropriate to the course objective. Even the hardiest freshman-level instructor feels thwarted over the concreteness and subjectivity of many of his students. The fact

that critical thinking has been shown to be related to academic success in college underscored the advisability of our investigating the role this ability plays in academic performance at Simon's Rock. Simon's Rock screens students for acceptable verbal and math aptitude scores, which are undoubtedly important predictors of a student's academic work, but perhaps less important than critical thinking in the study of a high school student's ability to meet college faculty expectations which typically call for formal thought rather than merely ability. Research has shown that Piaget's original assumption that individuals progress into the stage of formal, and by inference critical, thought in early adolescence may not hold true. Dulit[14] has demonstrated that only 60% of even gifted 16 year olds have fully attained formal thought; other researchers have shown that the acquisition of formal thought continues throughout the adult years and a substantial proportion of the general adult population may never fully reach the formal stage[15,16].

How do Simon's Rock freshmen compare with eighteen year old college freshmen elsewhere in the degree of critical thinking? Two measures of critical or analytic thinking have been used: The Embedded Figures Test (EFT) developed and studied by Witkin[17] and the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal (CT)[18]. For the purposes of this discussion, only the data from the Watson-Glaser measure will be reported since EFT and CT show similar patterns of correlations with performance measures but the CT is a stronger predictor.

Table I gives the distribution of Simon's Rock percentile scores on the CT and the class averages across four years compared with the norms of 11th graders and 18 year old liberal arts college freshmen.

Table I. Class Averages and Distributions of Simon's Rock Critical Thinking Percentile Scores.

	SIMON'S ROCK CLASS AVERAGE 11th Grade Norms	SIMON'S ROCK CLASS AVERAGE Freshman Norms	DISTRIBUTION Freshman Norms		
			BOTTOM 0-33%ile	MIDDLE 34-67%ile	TOP 68-69%ile
1973	78%ile	56%ile	30%	44%	26%
1974	80%ile	57%ile	25%	31%	44%
1975	82%ile	62%ile	21%	25%	54%
1976	74%ile	51%ile	20%	50%	30%
4 year average	79%ile	57%ile	24%	38%	39%

Clearly Simon's Rock students as a group are above average on critical thinking compared with 11th graders and with other college freshmen; however the distribution of test scores suggests that an estimated one out of every two or three students may not have fully reached Piaget's formal stage of thought upon entrance into Simon's Rock. This is not to say that only formal, critical thinkers enter other colleges, but simply that score distributions are not available for comparison. All the other measures used to assess new Simon's Rock students for intellectual ability and academic achievement (i.e., verbal ability, EFT, SAT scores and the General Educational Development exams establishing high school equivalency) have also

shown that as a group entering Simon's Rock students are average to well above average compared with 18 year old freshmen.

B. Critical Thinking as a Predictor of Academic Performance

Such a range in critical thinking ability among entering students is likely to be reflected in classroom performance. Before addressing the interesting question of faculty perceptions of students, let us examine the traditional indicators of academic ability: grades and academic probation. At Simon's Rock critical thinking has consistently been the best predictor, even over other measures such as Verbal and Math SAT scores, of grade point average, grades in specific Transition (freshman) year courses, and academic probation. Since student adjustment to the first year at the college has been of particular interest to groups involved in admissions and curriculum planning, Table II illustrates how strong a predictor critical thinking has been of first semester (and first year) academic performance. Table II gives the GPA for the first semester at Simon's Rock for students scoring at the bottom and top quartile on critical thinking contrasted to students scoring in the middle ranks. (In computing GPA, A = 4.00, B=3.00, C = 2.00, and D = 1.00). As a contrast, GPA's for the 1976 students with differing Verbal and Math SAT scores are also given (SAT scores are not available for almost half of each entering Simon's Rock class).

TABLE II. Grade Point Average for Students At Different Quartiles on Critical Thinking and with Different Verbal and Math SAT Scores.

CRITICAL THINKING

	BOTTOM (0-25%)	MIDDLE (26-75%)	TOP (76-99%)	Total n	Significance Level
1974	2.12	2.37	2.95	57	p. < .001
1975	2.36	2.68	2.95	81	p. < .01
1976	2.02	2.49	2.60	82	p. < .01

MATH AND VERBAL SAT

	LOW (0-440)	MEDIUM (441-512)	HIGH (513-587)	VERY HIGH (588 +)	Total n	Significance Level
1976						
MATH	2.40	2.32	2.55	2.76	34	n.s.
VERBAL	2.31	2.46	2.49	2.66	34	n.s.

One can see that GPA differs significantly --almost by as much as a full letter grade---when the two extreme groups on critical thinking are contrasted. The predictive strength of critical thinking is further illustrated by the CT scores of

students ending up on academic probation (GPA less than 1.80) their first fall semester: the 1974 CT percentile for AcPro students was 28% compared with class average at 57%; 1975 AcPro percentile was 35% compared with class average of 51%.

Some critical thinking skills are required and developed in virtually all fields of study, but it is generally accepted that formal thought is especially important in those scientific fields where logical proof and scientific method are emphasized, that is, the sciences, mathematics, and some of the social sciences. At Simon's Rock, studies undertaken in 1974 and 1976 have shown that this pattern of correlations holds true at an early college. For example, looking at a variety of introductory level courses across different semesters, freshman grades were correlated with critical thinking as follows (the asterisk indicates significance at < 05):

Science: .85*, .80*, .79*, .73*, .41*, .39*
Social Science: .80*, .61*, .59*, .56*, .39*, .38
Humanities: .46*, .30, .20, -.09

In the humanities courses at the freshman level (literature, drama, and art), where logic and recognition of bias is less frequently invoked than self-expression and written and verbal communication skills, one can see that the relationship between the CT and grades is less dramatic.

Critical thinking evidently plays a role, as well, in staying power at Simon's Rock. Table III gives the CT percentile scores of freshmen students returning to versus leaving Simon's Rock after the 1975 academic year. Similar data on attrition patterns prior to 1975 is not availaole.

TABLE III. Critical Thinking Scores for Students Returning Versus Leaving Simon's Rock After the 1975 Freshman Year.

	CRITICAL THINKING Average Percentile Score (College Freshman Norms)	n
Returning: BA Students	82%ile	13
Returning: AA Students	77%ile	11
Returning: Program Undecided	58%ile	43
Drop-Out or Suspension	30%ile	9
Transfer to Other Colleges	80%ile	9

If these findings are repeated in subsequent years, further study of critical thinking as a predictor of attrition certainly is warranted. Already, Simon's Rock has begun to include the CT test as a part of its admissions assessment, particularly when the academic ability of the applicant is in question. There is little justification for admitting a student into college early if the level of thought required in many of his first courses is beyond his capabilities at the time.

C. Faculty Perception of Students and Student Self-Concept

Simon's Rock Early College students are comparable to other freshmen in academic achievement and intellectual ability, but are bright 16 year olds **perceived** as different, or perhaps treated differently, by the faculty, compared with equally bright 18 year olds? If they are felt to be different by the faculty, what are the implications for teaching strategies, curriculum, faculty qualifications, and for the early college concept itself?

A large majority of faculty members feel that most of the 16 year old students are academically and intellectually ready for college although many have reservations about the emotional and social readiness of some of the students. Surveys of the faculty have shown that the observations and complaints of faculty fall into three categories: the need for greater structure, the need for more personal contact and feedback, and, to a lesser extent, objectionable student classroom behavior, varyingly described as silly, flippant, dilettantish, or dogmatic. Young faculty, in particular, are subject to what we now refer to as 'the new Ph.D syndrome': grumbling about how Simon's Rock students are not like students used to be and frustration over how to cope with this group of unknowns.

Two-thirds of the faculty have indicated that they have made adjustments in their teaching style to accommodate the needs of the younger student. Most have introduced more structure in their courses, including such adjustments as more explicit deadlines, an ongoing review and reminder of course requirements and expectations, more student/teacher contracts outlining what a student intends to accomplish in a course, clear and detailed course syllabi, and more formalized individual sessions with students to give comments and critiques of the student's work. The small size of the campus allows for a great deal of personal contact between faculty and students, and most of the faculty feel that this kind of frequent contact is crucial for the younger student.

In trying to understand the occasional faculty complaints that students are dogmatic or flippant, it is helpful to examine both the nature of the 16 year old and the student's perceptions of themselves. At 16, the young person is recently past puberty and must integrate his newly acquired sense of himself physically mature into a broadening self-image. As mentioned earlier, the 16 year old is also just emerging into the range of possibilities in the real world and the world of knowledge made possible by the acquisition of formal thought. Movement away from the family is accompanied often by temporary rebelliousness and rejection of dependent familial relationships, along with a paradoxical clinging to the peer group. The fantasy, plans, and insights of the 16 year old outflanks his actual experience, but he is not always appreciative of an adult's attempts to lend direction. The 18 year old, by contrast, is likely to be more weathered by time and aware of his limitations. It is in the area of self-concept and academic aspirations that the Simon's Rock student is most distinctly different from other college freshmen. Using the American Council of Education's annual survey data of college freshmen for comparison[9], one notes that Simon's Rock students are unusually ambitious academically with some 75-80% planning to obtain professional or graduate degrees (in comparison with the national average of 25%). The parents of Simon's Rock

students are themselves highly educated with a much larger proportion of both mothers and fathers holding graduate degrees than is true in other colleges (Simon's Rock: 50% of the fathers and 28% of the mothers compared with the private liberal arts college average of 25% of the fathers and 9% of the mothers). Simon's Rock students are self-confident, pride themselves in their intellectual and creative abilities, and expect to make important contributions in their fields. They are altruistic, interested in social issues, and not very interested in making money.

In evaluating these results on students attitudes, one must take into account that the image these young students have of themselves as independent, liberated, and self-motivated is not necessarily indicative of their actual behavior. They are, after all, relatively young people with unstable identities and untested perspectives on the larger social issues, and there is probably considerable discrepancy between how they see themselves and how others see them. So it may be with the faculty who teach the early college student---they detect the contradiction between the students' self-evaluation and their need for structure and direction. Some faculty can become discouraged and begin to question their expectations of students; other faculty see the contradiction as a problem but are challenged by it. Either group of Faculty can benefit from a developmental perspective that helps them to organize their observations and make reasonable adjustments in their teaching style. It is to the issue of developmental stage that I will now turn.

D. Psychological Maturity and Developmental Stage

Some developmental theorists conceive of development, not as a continuous, linear function representing the gradual accruing of adult or mature traits, but as a sequence of qualitatively different stages or periods in one's life. During each stage, traits and behaviors characteristic of the stage come to a peak and then wane or disappear as one moves into the next stage. Many prominent 'stage theorists', such as Piaget, Kohlberg, Loevinger, and Erikson, have written about the kinds of transitions that occur during early childhood and adolescence and the implications these have for education. Stage development is not, however, tied to chronological age, for at any given age one can expect to find individuals who are more or less advanced in the developmental sequence. Ideally, educational planners should consider the fact that students at the same age and grade level may differ significantly in developmental stage and will have differing educational needs as a function of these stage differences. Many more teachers in primary and secondary schools are aware of and responsive to these developmental differences than are faculty in our colleges and universities.

Recently the work of William Perry, Jr. of Harvard[20] has been influential in educational circles as a conceptual developmental framework for understanding the kinds of intellectual and philosophical shifts that take place during the college years. Perry describes structural changes in a person's assumptions about the origins of knowledge and values and how one forms intellectual and personal perspectives in a pluralistic society. He outlines a movement (across nine positions or stages) from a position which he calls 'dualistic', that is, viewing the world in polarities of right/-wrong, we/they, and good/bad and belief in external authority as the fountain of

truth, to higher positions called 'relativistic' or seeing all knowledge and values (including authority's) as contextual and relativistic within which affirmation of a personal identity and commitments evolve. Hefferman[21] and Chickering[22] have written about some of the implications of Perry's theory for student evaluation, faculty development, instructional development, and program and curriculum design. Since preliminary research at Harvard and elsewhere has indicated that a large number of college freshmen enter at the dualistic stage, some of the faculty planning groups at Simon's Rock are beginning to consider how Perry's work can illuminate our thinking about the needs of the young college student and the faculty who are learning to cope with them. Although we have not yet assessed our incoming students in terms of Perry positions, several things suggest a preponderance of dualistic students in the freshman classes: the need for structure, the low tolerance for ambiguity in class material, the problems some students have with team-teaching where there is no clear authority, the difficulty of some students with that part of the curriculum where the questions are big ones and the answers few, i.e., the social sciences, and the need for feedback and reassurance that they are on the 'right track'. In any case, it is evident that careful attention must go into curriulum planning for this age group and that fewer assumptions should be made about the level of development.

Although Simon's Rock evaluation project did not include an assessment of intellectual stages when it began tracking students, the study of the psychological development of the student was undertaken within the rubric of 'stage theory', specifically the theory of ego development outlined by Jane Loevinger[23,24]. Loevinger's empirical measure of ego developmental stage was chosen for our evaluation purposes, because it allows assessment of changes in the concept of the self, personal priorities and preoccupations, and perceived relationship between the self, others, and society. Both Loevinger [24] and Kohlberg[25] have discussed the intellectual prerequisites for several of their stages and agree that intellectual development is a logical precursor for stage change in other areas, such as moral reasoning or interpersonal style. The six stages and 3 transition stages defined and studied by Loevinger will not be described in detail here, although a brief general description of the major stage shifts follows.

Prior to the time when a child fully understands the functions of groups and identifies himself with the group (family, peers, society), his orientation to the world is largely an egocentric one. He fully comprehends that there are other people in the world but tends to focus on the self rather than the other in interpreting the world. Relationships are dependent (What can I receive from others?) or exploitative (How can I get what I want from others?). Impulses are acted upon, rather than controlled for the sake of social order. Moral thinking reveals a concern for obedience to authority or concern for advantage and control. Thinking is stereotyped, simplistic, and dichotomous. This is the period I shall call '**Preconformity**', and it includes Loevinger's impulsive and self-protective stages (I-2, Delta, and Delta/3). By the time American children have reached adolescence, the bulk of them have moved

beyond this stage, but there are a number of adolescents and even some adults who continue to manifest behavior and thinking that is predominantly preconformist in tone.

As the child or adolescent comes into greater contact with groups beyond the family, his orientation to others shifts in that a major source of identity now rests with the group. There is an increasing concern for societal rules, a wish to belong, an emphasis on conformity to group standards and values, and a preoccupation with social acceptability and appearance. Thinking is still simple and stereotyped and language is filled with cliches. This I shall call the **'Conformity'** period, which includes Loevinger's conformist and transitional self-aware stage (I-3 and I-3/4). Many adolescents and adults can be classified at this conformist stage. As Loevinger states[22], 'A factor in moving out of the conformist stage is awareness of oneself as not always living up to the iealized portrait set by social norms...Consciousness of the self is a prerequisite to the replacement of group standards by self-evaluated ones, characteristic of the next stage.'

The last category to be described is **'Post-Conformity'** which includes Loevinger's conscientious, autonomous, and integrated stages (I-4, I-4/5, I-5, I-6). Persons moving into these later stages show an increasing concern for self-evaluated standards and internally determined goals. Although the post-conformist is less influenced by group mores and values, he is more aware than ever before of the needs of other people and of the complexities and contradictions in human nature, and shows a much greater tolerance for diversity and difference. Individuality is a precious value along with respect for individual autonomy, mutuality and reciprocity in relationships, and personal responsibility. There is an increasing capacity for self-criticism and ability to cope with conflicting needs. There is a move from cognitive simplicity to complexity and differentiation. Thinking style characteristically shows a greater tolerance for ambiguity, a higher degreee of objectivity and abstraction, and perception of and concern for patterns and integrating links.

Some of the Loevinger's work[23] as well as that of other stage theorists such as Kohlberg[24], has suggested a relationship between education, particularly high education, and the movement out of the mid-stages of social conformity (Kohlberg's stages of conventional morality). Like Perry, these theorists point to the confrontation at college with new perspectives and contradictory values that shake the student out of his epistemological assumptions about the world. This transitional period between conformity and post-conformity (Perry's dualistic to relativistic shift or Kohlberg's 'sophomore relativists') often spans the early college years, and the success of students in resolving the questions of relativism of knowledge and values is, or should be, one of the primary objectives of higher education. Both Perry and Erickson[2] write about 'commitment within relativism', or the successful arrival at personal identity and meaning in one's life. Enduring commitments to a moral position, political ideology, life and career goals, and interpersonal values may be achieved during the college years, but more often than not, crystallization of commitments does not occur until well into one's twenties or thirties.

E. Developmental Stage of Simon's Rock Freshmen

As discussed earlier, the psychological maturity of early college students is probably one of the most important, and least studied, determinants of their successful adjustment at college. Psychological maturity, or ego developmental stage as we have defined it, should be a predictor of how a student goes about making critical educational decisions that confront him in college, how successful he is in coping with the expectations of self-initiated and independent work, and how able he is to deal with the increased social and personal freedom. The relative youth of students in an early college makes this a particularly important educational issue if the institution is structured along the lines of the traditional college, in which autonomy is encouraged, rather than the more tightly controlled and managed atmosphere in residential secondary schools.

Each new Simon's Rock student is assessed for stage of ego development upon entrance into the college, and subsequently classified into one of three groups: Preconformist, Conformist, (which includes the students in the conformist to post-conformist transition), and Post-Conformist. Results based on the 1973 to 1976 freshmen (see Table IV) indicate that Simon's Rock students are distributed all

TABLE IV. Distribution of Ego Developmental Stage for Simon's Rock Freshmen, 18-Year Old Freshmen, and 16-Year Olds.

SIMON'S ROCK FRESHMEN	PRE-CONFORMIST	CONFORMIST	POST-CONFORMIST
1973	13%	55%	32%
1974	25%	55%	21%
1975	5%	75%	21%
1976	10%	79%	11%
4 year average	14%	60%	26%
COLLEGE FRESHMEN: 18 YEARS			
Ivy League College	7%	25%	68%
Urban University	8%	45%	47%
Engineering School	13%	48%	39%
Teacher's College	10%	56%	34%
National Survey*	16%	52%	31%
OTHER 16-YEAR OLDS			
Selective Prep School	3%	78%	19%
National Survey*	32%	61%	7%

*My thanks to Daniel Yankelovitch and Robert Holt for supplying this data. The data was drawn from a 1975 Yankelovitch survey of American College and non-college youth.

along the developmental continuum and are somewhat less advanced psychologically (that is, the appearance of fewer students at higher developmental stages) than comparable groups of 18 year old college freshmen.

However, comparison with the 16 year old samples show that, on the average, there are more entering students already at the Post-Conformist stage at Simon's Rock than in the two other groups. It is clear that the early college student is more advanced developmentally than the average 16 year old (college-bound and non college-bound) and probably comparable to the 16 year olds in most selective college preparatory programs.

Of interest are the changes in the distributions of ego stages from 1973-74 to 1975-76. In 1975 and 1976, the majority of new students (close to 80%) were classified as being at the Conformist stage or at the beginning of the transition to post-conformity. This marked homogeneity in developmental stage of new students is important not only because of its bearing on academic and social planning, but also in considering the impact of the social milieu on the development of the individual. If most of the freshmen and sophomore students in an early college were to be at the Conformist stage developmentally (and at Simon's Rock these first two classes constitue close to 75% of the student body), one must wonder how influential the prevailing attitudes and values of the peer group might be and whether the power of the norm may not represent an anti-developmental force on campus. Theodore Newcomb, in discussing his studies of student-development[27], has referred to this phenomena, saying that one must understand the prevailing reference group to understand what kind of change is possible. As Newcomb has demonstrated, a conservative milieu inside a campus sorority breeds conservatism; life on a liberal campus valuing individuality and autonomy fosters independence. At Simon's Rock, it is possible that there may be two contradictory forces at work on the individual student: the institutional ideological push toward autonomy and independence versus the peer group values of the Conformist stage. It is also possible that the student groups on the ends of the developmental continuum, that is, the Pre-Conformists and Post-Conformists, may have an effect on the behavior and values of the middle group that far outweighs their numbers. To further explore these issues, I would like to turn to some of the evaluation studies of stage development and student behavior.

F. Developmental Stage as a Predictor of Campus Behavior

Although ego stage is predictive of the seriousness with which students undertake their academic work and apply themselves to their studies, ego developmental stage has been consistently unrelated to academic performance in our studies at Simon's Rock. Faculty, who are not aware of students' stage classification, tend to see the Pre-Conformist students as lacking self-discipline with the least investment in the external trappings of their written work (e.g., neatness, good editing). Feedback from the students themselves indicate differences in academic aspirations and motives as a function of developmental stage. Most Post-Conformist students plan to go on to graduate work and 60% cite 'involvement in course-work' as the greatest

expected source of personal satisfaction during their college careers. In contrast, 33% of the Pre-Conformist students expect to study beyond the B.A. and only 30% cite studies as potentially gratifying. However, almost 100% of these students expect to be 'more successful than most people'. Of greatest importance to the Pre-Conformist students, checked by almost 70%, is 'self-discovery and self-insight'. This notable lack of academic ambition and goal-planning together with a preoccupation with the self are characteristics of the Pre-Conformist stage as Loevinger describes it. Students classified at the Conformist stage fall midway between the other two groups on the above characteristics. In summary, it seems that, although there is no difference between the more mature and less mature students in intellectual capacity or even academic performance, there is a considerable difference in the level of academic aspiration and in the extent to which they may be aware of the critical factors in making career and life decisions.

We have also been studying how 16 year olds react and adjust to non-academic college life, dormitory living, and special Transition Year programs that the college offers. There are large and significant differences in behavior, projected image, and attitudes that distinguish the students at either end of the developmental continuum with the Conformist group generally falling somewhere between the two.

For the past four years, we have obtained independent ratings from Simon's Rock staff members who have been in close touch with the students outside of the classroom, and who were familiar with their roles and behavior on campus. When rated for leadership and campus role, the differences between the three developmental groups were dramatic. Table V gives the percentages of students rated in each category in response to the question 'Is the student a leader on campus?'

TABLE V. Ratings of Students for Leadership Role as a Function of Developmental Stage

		PRE-CONFORMIST	CONFORMIST	POST-CONFORMIST
Student is a mature model	1973	9%	29%	44%
	1974	18%	21%	31%
	1975	0%	29%	50%
	1976	9%	20%	50%
Student is a catalyst for partying	1973	55%	35%	12%
	1974	18%	38%	20%
	1975	50%	13%	0%
	1976	33%	17%	10%

Post-Conformist students are far more likely to be rated as mature models who are serious and involved in extracurricular activities, whereas Pre-Conformist students are more likely to be perceived as partiers and instigators of disruptive activities. The one exceptional year, 1974, in which this pattern does not hold as strongly was indeed an unusual one. Several of the outstanding able students intellectually were

classified as Pre-Conformist, and there were a larger number of Pre-Conformists compared to other years. In the Spring, there was an outburst of student activism reminiscent of the 1960's in which some students from all three developmental groups took part. In trying to understand the dynamics of any student movement, however, it is important that one keep in mind the findings of the Block, Haan, and Smith study of student activists[28] which demonstrated that students classified at different developmental stages have very different motives and rationales for their activities, with higher stage individuals operating on the basis of moral principles rather than self-interest. The more vocal members of the student body, if they be Post-Conformist or Pre-Conformist, may be able to set the emotional tone on campus and steer the group in the middle toward principled or self-indulgent ends.

An examination of judicial records has also contributed to our understanding of the relationship between developmental stage and behavior. The judicial committee at Simon's Rock is a student-faculty committee which has jurisdiction over most disciplinary action taken. Students can be brought before judicial by any community member for a wide variety of offenses ranging from excessive noise, non-payment of a traffic fine, and drinking beer in the dorms, to the far more serious offenses of stealing or selling drugs. Only the most serious or repeated offenses warrant disciplinary probation or suspension. Table VI gives the judicial records of 1973-76 students their first year on campus.

TABLE VI. Judicial Records of 1973-1976 Students Combined and Classified by Developmental Stages

	PRE-CONFORMIST [n = 43]	CONFORMIST [n = 155]	POST-CONFORMIST [n = 68]
Suspected of behavior that would warrant judicial action	84%	56%	49%
Brought before judicial committee	56%	52%	32%
Put on judicial probation	19%	11%	9%
Suspended from school	7%	3%	3%

Again, we see that the Pre-Conformist student is more likely to be suspected, charged, and given judicial penalties than the other two groups of students.

Some of our evaluation studies have focused on the frequency and nature of student contact with the College Health Service. One such study (in 1974) involved having attending nurses rate students seen at the service for maturity of judgement in matters concerning responsibility for one's health and body and acceptance of treatment. Of the 106 students then being tracked by the evaluation office, 92 were seen by the health service. Frequency of visits was unrelated to developmental stage; nurses' ratings of maturity of judgement were related to stage. Almost 50% of the Post-Conformist and Conformist groups were rated as mature. In a later study of ninety 1975 and 1976 freshmen, frequency of contact was again unrelated to

developmental stage, although two out of three Post-Conformist boys presented a mixed psychological-medical symptom picture with common complaints of anxiety in heterosexual relationships. Post-Conformist girls were the only group who came to the Health Services with manifest psychological problems.

Although these findings are tentative due to sample size and lack of direct access to the health records, they do seem to indicate a degree of self-awareness and psychological mindedness in the most mature of the 16 year olds studied. They also suggest that future studies should focus on the particular problems of the Post-Conformist 16 year old, who is developmentally out of phase with most of his peers and may be experiencing some interpersonal difficulties.

In another study in 1974, students were asked to fill out a questionnaire as part of the evaluation of a required freshman-year seminar on issues presumably important to mid-adolescents (identity, sexuality, drugs, family and peer relationships). Almost the entire group of Pre-Conformist students (over 80%) found the seminar to be a waste of time and resented having to go; none felt that the discussions were important or made them think. In contrast, over 80% of the Post-Conformist students felt that the discussions were important. 60% of the Conformist group felt the seminar was a waste of time. The less mature students objected to what they felt was adult sermonizing and a focus on adolescence in the abstract rather than on events closer to their own lives.

Finally, in addition to the relationships shown between developmental stage, attitudes and campus behavior, attrition patterns also have been shown to be related to maturity. During 1973-1975, there was no difference between the developmental stage of students staying at Simon's Rock after their first year versus those leaving, but reasons for leaving were significantly related to ego stage. Most of the Pre-Conformist students were leaving because they were dropping out of school on their own initiative or had been suspended for academic or disciplinary reasons; the majority of Post-Conformist students were transferring to other colleges.

G. Student Development and Change

The nature and degree of intellectual and psychological growth during a student's tenure at an early college is, of course, a key issue in evaluating the validity of the early college concept. Even though students entering an early college may be developmentally behind their 18 year old counterparts, is their development accelerated or do they develop at a 'normal' pace? By the time early college students are ready to graduate, can they compete with other college graduates in graduate or professional schools and in the job market? Unfortunately, we have not yet had the amount of time needed to track enough students to have solid answers to these questions although there is some data from which to draw tentative conclusions.

Each year, the Simon's Rock sophomore class is given the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exams toward the end of their second (spring) semester. The CLEP exams are a common means of testing academic achievement and establishing sophomore standing in five basic areas of liberal arts education---English Composition, Natural Sciences, Mathematics, Humanities, Social Sciences and History. Many colleges use the CLEP scores for advanced placement. Table

VII gives the average Simon's Rock CLEP scores over the past four years. Compared to college sophomore norms, the early college students have scored at approximately the 60th percentile, that is, well above average.

TABLE VII. Percentage Scores on the CLEP Exams for Simon's Rock Sophomores

	ENG COMP	MATH	NATURAL SCIENCE	HUMANITIES	SOC SC/ HISTORY	AVG. %ile
1974	69%	63%	65%	67%	48%	62%
1975	63%	56%	81%	77%	70%	69%
1976	61%	56%	56%	69%	63%	61%
1977	63%	64%	55%	53%	50%	57%

Ego growth during college was a focus for one evaluation study in 1975. The Simon's Rock data on stage change is scanty at this point, and there are only a few other colleges involved in the longitudinal study of student ego development. The comparison data that is available is reported in Table VIII, and, in some cases, only class percentile distributions are given without the corresponding distributions of scores as entering freshmen.

TABLE VIII. Distribution of Developmental Stages After Freshman and Senior Years (Stage distribution as entering freshmen given in parenthesis if available).

	N	PRE-CONFORMIST	CONFORMIST	POST-CONFORMIST
AFTER FRESHMAN YEAR				
Simon's Rock	38	(29%) 11%	(37%) 47%	(34%) 45%
Large University	36	0%	45%	55%
National Survey		11%	55%	34%
AFTER SENIOR YEAR				
Simon's Rock:				
1976 Graduates	6	(33%) 0%	(0%) 17%	(67%) 83%
1977 Graduates	8	(25%) 0%	(63%) 38%	(12%) 62%
Large University	53	2%	27%	71%
Engineering School:				
1974 Graduates	26	(27%) 0%	(69%) 38%	(4%) 62%
1975 Graduates	58	(10%) 2%	(55%) 40%	(34%) 59%
National Survey		3%	44%	54%

One can see that change in the early college years at Simon's Rock is comparable to, if not more rapid than, change at other colleges. Developmentally lower stage students, even after one year, catch up with their 18 to 19 year old counterparts, and a significant proportion of the mid-stage students shift into the Post-Conformist stage by the sophomore year. Not all students have moved into the Post-Conformist

79

stage by graduation but neither have all seniors at other colleges. Tentatively then, we can conclude that as yet there is little evidence that early college students lag behind other college students developmentally. Some of the students who entered Simon's Rock at the Pre-Conformist level have advanced the most in the developmental sequence, suggesting that one should not necessarily assume that only the mature 16 year old can benefit from entering college early. These less mature students report as seniors that the high expectations and encouragement of independent thought contributed to their personal growth.

The numbers of students who have graduated (or will graduate) in 1977 from the relatively new B.A. program is small: a total of 18 students since the first graduating class of 1976. Of these, only 14 were followed across all four years at Simon's Rock. Eight of the 18 have applied to graduate or medical schools, and all have been accepted. The remaining graduates have chosen to work or travel before making a decision about further education. Interestingly, many of these latter students feel that their experience at Simon's Rock moved them away from what they consider now to be premature career goals and widened the options for them while relieving them of the pressure to make a decision.

In 1975 a mail survey was made of all students who had ever attended Simon's Rock. Almost 90% of the students who responded to the survey were attending or had attended other schools after leaving Simon's Rock, 26% had already obtained B.A. degrees elsewhere, and 8% were in graduate school. Since half of the students responding had obtained an A.A. degree at Simon's Rock, it is clear that the A.A. degreee is not a terminal degree for most students. The students who continued their education elsewhere were matriculated at 83 different schools in the U.S. from the Eastern Ivy-League institutions and large state universities to smaller colleges and art institutes. Most students felt extremely well-prepared to handle the challenges at their new institutions, and in fact the reported grade point average at the new schools was significantly higher than the cumulative GPA at the point of departure from Simon's Rock (B+ compared with B−).

H. Summary of Findings

The following section outlines the major findings of the evaluation studies concerning intellectual characteristics and academic performances, attitudes and self-concept, and psychological maturity of the Simon's Rock Early College (SR) students.

Intellectual and Academic:

1. Verbal and quantitative ability are average for college freshmen.

2. SR students are well above average on tests of high school equivalency (GED).

3. Critical thinking ability is above the college freshman average, but the distribution of CT scores suggests that some entering students may not have attained Piaget's formal stage of thought.

4. Students on academic probation tend to have the lowest critical thinking scores.

5. Among students leaving Simon's Rock before graduation, drop-outs and suspended students have low critical thinking socres; transfers are high on critical thinking.

6. Faculty feel that students are comparable to other college students academically but have reservations about emotional readiness.

7. Two-thirds of the faculty say they make adjustments in teaching SR freshmen in the direction of greater structure.

8. SR sophomores compare favorably (above average) with other sophomores on academic achievement in the liberal arts CLEP exams.

9. Seniors are able to compete for admission in graduate school.

Attitudes:

1. SR freshmen are very ambitious academically. Almost 80% plan on graduate work or professional schools. A high proportion of SR parents have graduate degrees.

2. SR students are self-confident and have high expectations of eventually making creative and intellectual contributions to society.

3. Students have a self-image as liberated and self-motivated.

Psychological Maturity:

1. Simon's Rock students are less advanced than 18 year old freshmen in terms of the proportion of students in the highest developmental stages (most mature); however, they are more advanced than the average 16 year old and comparble to students in selective prep schools.

2. Most developmentally lower stage students move up to mid-stages after the freshman year; after one year some mid-stage students move into the highest stages of post-conformity.

3. The Post-Conformist (developmentally advanced) students as a group have the following characteristics:

--they are more serious about academics
--they are rated by others as constructive models and leaders on campus
--they are more responsive to values seminars

--boys report more anxiety in heterosexual relationships
--girls acknowledge more psychological problems
--if they leave SR before obtaining degrees, they leave as transfer students

4. The Pre-Conformist (developmentally behind) students are:

--less serious and ambitious about academic work
--somewhat unrealistic in assessing factors contributing to life and career success
--catalysts for disruptive activities
--more subject to disciplinary action
--rated as less mature about personal health
--apt to leave Simon's Rock as drop-outs or to be suspended

5. SR seniors are developmentally on a par with seniors at other colleges.

Post-Graduation:

1. Half the B.A. graduates thus far have applied and been admitted to graduate school.

2. Most A.A. graduates and SR students who have left before obtaining degrees are attending or graduating from other colleges and report that they are getting better grades in their new colleges.

Implications and Discussion

When a young person makes the decision to leave high school early in order to attend college he undoubtedly is making a decision, whether he is aware of it or not, that may have implications for his future academic and social growth and for the directions his life may take. No one yet knows what the negative consequences of missing the last years of high school may be. Some parents and students feel that security and tradition of high school life is too vital an experience to miss and that accelerating one's education is at some undetermined expense; other parents and students feel that any change that reawakens intellectual curiosity and frees the spirit is better than the educational status quo. Early college will be the answer for some people, but it is not, nor should it be, the answer for all.

The experience at Simon's Rock has high-lighted some of the factors that contribute to successful adjustment at an early college, although, in interpreting the findings from the evaluation study of student development, one must keep in mind

that Simon's Rock may be an instiutitional model for change, but it is only one of many possible versions of early education. Furthermore, the institution itself is in a state of flux and continuing revision as our understanding of the critical educational issues unfolds. As the institution changes, so does the nature of the student attracted to it.

With this in mind, I would like to discuss some of the findings concerning students coming to Simon's Rock at different levels of academic and psychological readiness.

The first question to ask about the immature student, either the 16 year old Pre-Conformist or the student who is not yet capable of critical, abstract thought, is: 'Should he be in college at all?' On balance, the evidence from Simon's Rock suggests that he should not be. Academically, this student is at a disadvantage in the classroom. Faculty tend to expect a higher level of performance than he is capable of, and many faculty feel they are called on to bring the less able students up to the level of the rest of the class before they can proceed toward the true objectives of the college course. Other students in the class who are developmentally further along tend to be far more serious about their classwork and are occasionally resentful of the immature student's 'child-like' and casual approach to the subject matter. The correlation of course grades with critical thinking indicates that the academic performance of the less able student suffers, and the student is apt to end up on academic probation--a demoralizing and ominous status of the young student who probably expected college life to be more manageable than high school. This student's lack of seriousness about his education extends into his behavior on campus. His experimentation with his new freedoms involves him in activities that often lead to disciplinary retribution and new grounds for disappointment in authority and educational institutions in general. On the whole, it is not a very good beginning for a student whose stage of development is such that he is provocative and difficult to work with but in need of very special individualized attention and personal challenges. This kind of young person exists in all schools, at both the secondary and college level, but it is doubtful that an early college faculty and staff whose full attention is promised to the motivated and able young person, should be expected to come to the rescue of this particular group of adolescents, even if it could.

Giving up the responsibility for the less mature 16 year olds does not imply that early college staff should not be concerned with the developmental needs of the students with whom they work. Most of the students now coming to Simon's Rock are in the mid-stages of ego growth and are just becoming aware of multiplicity in the world and an explosion of choices. They are naturally preoccupied with themselves, their identity, and the exploration of possibilities. Some of these students are just beginning to develop the mental tools and structures with which they can make sense of their world, and they still tend to rely on others to lead the way, to point out directions. In other words, they are susceptible to influence by peers, by perceived authorities, by heroic figures, some of whom may be adults. It is this susceptibility to the group that one must take into account on an early college campus. In the absence of large numbers of older students working toward

83

academic goals, acting as models for social interaction, the conformist student is apt to be swayed by the vocal and boisterious pre-conformist students or by the self-perpetuating standards and values of the conformist group itself. Little information was gathered during the past evaluation studies on the problems of the transitional student and on the kinds of stimulation and experiences that contribute to growth during this period. Since there seem to be a sizable number of such students at Simon's Rock and elsewhere who do not move beyond this transitional stage from conformity to post-conformity by the time of their graduation, further study should be made of the characteristics and developmental timetable of this group. A closer, more clinical analysis of the developmental crises and tasks of transitional students may reveal indicators of readiness for or resistance to change. Such an inquiry also has implications for the kinds of programs, support systems, and opportunities best suited for the slower versus faster maturing adolescents.

A final question is: 'What is life like for the developmentally advanced 16 year old on an early college campus?' The intellectually advanced Simon's Rock student usually accepts and appreciates the opportunity to study at the college level and many begin independent study projects as soon as he can get approval. These students presumably can take full advantage of the interdisciplinary offerings, having both intellectual scope and tolerance for complexity. As mentioned earlier, the more able students are among the most impatient with their less-serious peers and often prefer to work with faculty on an independent study or tutorial basis. The seeking out of faculty, the involvement in student/faculty committee work, and the value placed on social contacts with faculty may reflect the need of the most mature student to separate themselves from their peers and identify with an older group of people. However, their self-awareness, their sense of being 'older' or beyond the interests of the adolescents around them, probably has its negative effects. They are, after all, still only 16 years old and must live with and associate with 16 year olds primarily (at least in the freshman dorm). The psychological stress of growing up early, while having relatively little intimate experience with others, must complicate the life of these students and contribute to the kinds of psychological problems that they bring to the Health Service staff. Fortunately, only a few of these students are unable to cope with being out of the mainstream and knowing it. Most speak of the pleasures of turning inside oneself, or to one's work, or to a few close friends in the absence of a larger and more varied social group with whom they can interact. They have ultimately accelerated their entry into the real world by coming to an early college and are willing to tolerate the delay for the sake of their education.

The viability of the early college concept will not rest on the success or failure of Simon's Rock as an institution. The changing age structure of American society suggests the need for greater attention to continuing adult education. Our economic future is unstable, and the early entry of a large number of young college graduates into the job market may be unsupportable. Our current system and pace of socializing and educating young people may be so entrenched that the demand for institutions servicing the potential early college student will be negligible. However, with the societal ideals of individual advancement, realization of personal potential, and maximum options for all, there should be a place for early colleges and

motivated 16 year olds. Simon's Rock experience with the developmental needs of this age group hopefully will open up discussion among people interested in innovative and sensible education.

85

FOOTNOTES

[1] 'More in high school doing college work,' **New York Times** (1 June 1975) sec. 1, p. 1.

[2] Erickson, E. **Identity: Youth and Crisis** (New York: Norton, 1968).

[3] Keniston, K. **Youth and Dissent** (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1971).

[4] The Four-School Study Committee. **16-20: The Liberal Education of an Age Group** (Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970).

[5] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. **Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond High School** (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971).

[6] White House Conference on Youth 'Preamble.' Recommendations and Resolutions. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971).

[7] Hutchins, R.M. **The Higher Learning in America** (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936).

[8] Hall, E. 'The house of education needs overhaul.' National Association of Independent Schools, 1967.

[10] Blos, P. **Normal Adolescence: Its Dynamics and Impact** (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968).

[11] Hall, E. 'A model for reform in the structure of higher education.' Simon's Rock Early College, 1972.

[12] Graduate Record Examination Board **Newsletter.** Princeton, N.J. No. 24, February-March, 1977.

[13] Inhelder, B. and Piaget, J., **The Growth of Logical Thinking From Childhood to Adolescence** (New York: Basic Books, 1958).

[14] Dulit, E. 'Adolescent thinking à la Piaget: The formal stage.' **Journal of Youth and Adolescence, I,** 1972.

[15] Piaget, J. 'Intellectual evolution from adolescence to childhood.' **Human Development,** 15, 1972.

[16] Tomlinson-Keasey, C. 'Formal operations in females ages 11 to 54 years of age.' **Developmental Psychology, 6,** 364, 1972.

[17]Witkin, H.A., Dyk, R.B., Faterson, H.F., Goodenough, D.R., and Karp, S.A. **Psychological Differentiation: Studies of Development** (Potomac, Md.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1974; (originally published: New York: Wiley, 1962)

[18]Watson, G. and Glaser, E.M. **Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal Manual** (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1952).

[19]Astin, A.W., King, M.R., and Richardson, G.T. **The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1973-1976,** 4 Vols. (Los Angeles: American Council on Education U. Calif., 1973-76).

[20]Perry, W.G., Jr. **Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme** (New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1970).

[21]Hefferman, J.M. 'An analytical framework for planning and research in higher education.' **Liberal Education,** Vol. LXI, No. 4, December, 1975.

[22]Chickering, A.M. 'Developmental change as a major outcome.' In M.T. Keeton (ed) **Experiental Learning** (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976).

[23]Loevinger, J. and Wessler, R. **Measuring Ego Development,** Vol 1 and 2 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970).

[24]Loevinger, J. **Ego Development** (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976).

[25]Kohlberg, L. 'Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D.A. Goslin (ed) **Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research** (New York: Rand-McNally, 1969).

[26]Kohlberg, L. and Gilligan, C. 'The adolescent as a philosopher: The discovery of the self in a postconventional world.' In **Daedalus** (Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences) Fall, 1971.

[27]Interview with Theodore Newcomb. **Psychology Today,** September, 1974.

[28]Block, J.H., Haan, N., and Smith, M.B., 'Socialization correlates of student activism.' **Journal of Social Issues,** Vol. 25, 4, 1969.

WHO SHOULD ENTER COLLEGE EARLY?

Samuel H. Magill

Should anyone go to college before completing secondary school? If so, who should be encouraged? If not, why not? The position taken in this paper is that some students should do so but that great caution should be exercised in the process of determining who should and who should not.

Robert Hutchins believed that the very gifted young should be encouraged to accelerate their academic careers, and for over twenty years University College at the University of Chicago served to give expression to his belief.[1] The Johns Hopkins University's program for gifted science and mathematics students is a contemporary expression of the same philosophy.

Elizabeth B. Hall, at one time headmistress of Concord Academy and the founder of Simon's Rock, believed that the entire educational system should be reformed because young people today experience earlier physical and intellectual maturation than older generations and are ready for college by the time they are 16.[2] She founded Simon's Rock as an early college intending it to be a model for all of education to emulate. Simon's Rock admits students into its college program who have completed the 10th grade of high school. They can earn an A.A. degree in two or a B.A. degree in four. Thus, two years are eliminated from the educational process, thereby breaking the 'lockstep' which she sought to reform.

At the other extreme of the spectrum are those educators who do not believe that the traditional pattern should be modified at all, that four years of secondary school are a necessary maturing experience as preparation for the learning experience in the university or college. Admittedly, some of these traditionalists resist early admission because their institutions are unprepared to handle younger students. However, much resistance is grounded in the conviction that their social and emotional maturity is not sufficient to handle the demands and competition of college.

There is considerable experience over at least twenty-five years which has provided a substantial basis for support of the notion that secondary school students are capable of undertaking college level work. Not only the experience of Chicago and Hopkins but years of experience with the College Board Advanced Placement Tests and the experience of many colleges which have admitted high school students to part-time study have contributed to this body of evidence. The Four School Study Committee's report, **16-20: The Liberal Education of an Age Group**[3], and the report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, **Less Time, More Options,**[4] reinforce this position. They argue that even though younger students are less mature socially and emotionally, their academic achievement and intellectual maturity warrant early admission to college. The CEEB report, of course, argued for a new kind of institution which it called an 'intermediate college,' bridging the last two years of high school and the first two years of college. The Carnegie Commission, however, called for genuine time-shortening. Its position was grounded in

many studies which indicate that there is enormous redundance in the first two years of college and that as much as possible of the redunnce ought to be eliminated by early entry into college.

However, there is another view emerging which is based on analyses of ego development and critical thinking. It holds that measures of academic achievement or aptitude are insufficient indices of college readiness and that it is important to know what states of ego and cognitive development a student has attained in order to predict probable success in college. 'Critical thinking, as it is usually defined, is quite similar to what Piaget calls formal thought: inferential reasoning, deductive logic, probabilistic and relational thought, and abstraction. In addition, the critical thinker can recognize presuppositions in arguments and distinguish relevance from irrelevance."[5] This ability has been measured quite effectively by the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal and has been in use for some time at Simon's Rock. While a number of developmental psychologists have contributed to our understanding of ego development, the work of Perry,[6] Loevinger,[7] and Kohlberg[8] at Harvard has informed the studies at Simon's Rock. We believe that our experience at Simon's Rock is representative of this more recent view and that it is instrctuve in endeavoring to answer the questions I posed at the outset.

For the past five years we have been testing students at Simon's Rock and, for purposes of conceptual simplification, we have classified them in terms of three major stage shifts which are congenial with Loevinger's description of the phenomena. The first stage has been called **pre-conformist** by Dr. Nancy Goldberger in her report of the longitudinal study at Simon's Rock, **Breaking the Educational Lockstep: The Simon's Rock Experience.**[9] She describes pre-conformity in the fashion:

> Prior to the time when a child fully understands the functions of groups and identifies himself with the group (family, peers, society), his orientation to the world is largely an egocentric one...Relationships are dependent...or exploitative...Impulses are acted upon, rather than controlled for the sake of social order. Moral thinking reveals a concern for obedience to authority or concern for advantage and control. Thinking is stereotyped, simplistic, and dichotomous....[10]

The second stage is called **conformist** and is probably characteristic of most entering college freshmen. She writes:

> As the child or adolescent comes into greater contact with groups beyond the family, his orientation to others shifts in that a major source of identity now rests with the group. There is an increasing concern for societal rules, a wish to belong, an emphasis on conformity to group standards and values, and a preoccupation with social acceptability and appearance. Thinking is still simple and stereotyped and language is filled with cliches....[11]

Finally, Goldberger writes of the **post-conformist** student with the following characterization:

> Persons moving into these later stages show increasing concern for self-evaluated standards and internally determined goals. Although the post-conformist is less influenced by group mores and values, he is more aware than ever before of the needs of other people and of the complexities and contradictions in human nature, and shows a much greater tolerance for diversity and difference. Individuality is a precious value along with respect for individual autonomy, mutuality and reciprocity in relationships, and personal responsibility. There is an increasing capacity for self-criticism and ability to cope with conflicting needs. There is a move from cognitive simplicity to complexity and differentiation. Thinking style characteristically shows a greater tolerance for ambiguity, a higher degree of objectivity and abstraction, and perception of and concern for patterns and integrating links.'[12]

While it would appear that most American children move beyond the pre-conformist stage by the time of adolescence, and certainly by the time they reach normal college age, there are many who continue to demonstrate behavior and attitudes in college and even the adult years which are pre-conformist in tone. Our experience at Simon's Rock with younger-than-usual adolescents has convinced us that, for the most part, students still dominated by pre-conformist behavior, attitudes, values, and perceptions are not ready for the challenges of college and university life and, indeed, may prove to be negative influences in the collegiate environment. Given time, attention, and the proper supportive environment, there is little doubt that pre-conformist students will move rapidly into higher stages of development, but the costs to the institution and to the other students may be too great to warrant the risk of having them in the institution. This is the basis for my contention that colleges and universities must be very cautious in their recruitment of the early student.

At Simon's Rock we have found some interesting things about our students. 'The post-conformist...students as a group are more serious about academics; they are rated by others as constructive models and leaders on campus; they are more responsive to values seminars; boys report more anxiety in heterosexual relationships; girls acknowledge more psychological problems; and if they leave Simon's Rock before obtaining degrees, they leave as transfer students.' On the other hand, 'The pre-conformist students are less serious and ambitious about academic work, somewhat unrealistic in assessing factors contributing to life and career success, catalysts for disruptive activities, more subject to disciplinary action, rated as less mature about personal health, and apt to leave Simon's Rock as drop out or to be suspended.'[13]

Taking our students as a whole group, the Simon's Rock faculty perceive most of them as academically and intellectually ready, but they have reservations about their emotional and social readiness. They regard their students as needing far greater

90

structure and more personal contact and feedback. When faculty and administrators seek to impose greater structure and undertake greater contact and feedback, students have an exceedingly difficult time understanding since their own self-image is far more positive. Not surprisingly, the loudest protestations come from the pre-conformist students.

A mix of all three developmental stages in the student body, particularly when the pre-conformist group constitutes a substantial proportion of the entering class, makes the development of educational policy not only difficult but hazardous for the institution as well. This is true both for curricular and student life policies.

When the curriculum was designed at Simon's Rock, it was designed for relatively mature students on the assumption that intellectually able young students did not need a highly structured curriculum. It had all the characteristics of the curricular trends of the late sixties: a free elective system dependent upon a good advising system. If, in fact, most Simon's Rock students were conformist or post-conformist students, it was a reasonable system since they are more likely to be responsive to adult guidance or less in need of it than pre-conformist students. With the presence of a relatively large number of pre-conformist students this year, it has become clear, quite apart from curricular philosophical grounds, that an elective, *laissez-faire* structure and approach does not serve their needs. Rather, a more structured set of requirements and expectations is essential if they are to be able to pursue their own objectives successfully.

Even though faculty may respond sensitively to individual needs within a particular class, it is exceedingly difficult to devise curricular models for the entire range of students. The pre-conformist student resists structure because of the need to resist authority or reject adult guidance. The post-conformist tends to resist structure too, but for different reasons, e.g., greater self-confidence grounded in autonomous standards and self-knowledge. However, the latter can be persuaded on conceptual grounds that some kind of structure makes academic sense. The conformist student is the most likely to accept curricular structure unless, of course, the entire peer group is dominated by the attitudes of pre-conformists. And, of course, the substance of curricular offerings depends heavily upon the level of critical thinking characteristic of the group. Students unable to engage in Piaget's 'formal thought' will likely not be able to participate effectively in courses in philosophy, ethics, social theory, and the like. One can readily appreciate the difficulties an instructor would face when encountering a class with widely different capabilities.

Campus life policies are similarly difficult to devise and potentially more troublesome once imposed. Pre-conformist students appear to need more constraints and guidance than others if they are to function academically. Without them they tend to be disruptive socially and tend to engage extensively in potentially harmful activities, both to themselves and to the community as a whole. Post-conformist students, on the other hand, need more latitude as they mature. Such students need to be given more responsibility for their lives and, as they demonstrate that they can handle freedom in relatively mature ways, they can be accorded increasing measures of it. Where the attitudes of entering students are dominated by

91

the pre-conformist mind-set of a minority, it means that more restrictive policies must be pursued lest the entire group be thrown into a relatively chaotic pattern of behavior.

We have concluded at Simon's Rock that all early college students require more adult attention and presence than their older peers at other colleges. They all are going through a difficult period of transition in their development from adolescence to adulthood and need mature support at every stage. But the disruptive presence of pre-conformist students can needlessly complicate the educational task and render ineffective the educational program.

Let me conclude with the following three points. First, sheer academic/intellectual achievement or aptitude is not a sufficient basis for college admissions, particularly in the case of students who seek admission prior to the completion of high school. An assessment of the stage of ego development and critical thinking is critically important in determining readiness for college work and experience. In our experience at Simon's Rock only conformist or post-conformist students possessing above average academic or intellectual aptitude should be encouraged. Pre-conformist students require so much of institutional resources, i.e., faculty and staff time, and structure that other students are short-changed and needlessly constrained. Further, the intellectual and social climate produced by aggressive pre-conformist students is inimical to liberal and humane learning and to a healthy campus environment.

Second, all colleges which are engaged in the admission of younger students should be alert to the special needs of those younger students. They should be prepared to make special provision for them in terms of counseling, guidance, residential life, and the like. To admit any number of sixteen or seventeen year old students without doing so is irresponsible. Better not to admit them than to eschew any responsibility for introducing them into an environment dominated by older students and lacking the support systems which they must have.

Third, our national programs of testing should include measures of ego development and critical thinking. Already the Educational Testing Service has moved to incorporate a critical thinking component in the Graduate Record Examination, but the P.S.A.T. and the S.A.T. should be modified to incorporate such measures. The problems which Simon's Rock has experienced through the admission of pre-conformist students, who were well qualified otherwise, might have been avoided had some pre-admission data on stage development and critical thinking been available.

Early admission and the early college is an important option for many students, and the range of options needs to be expanded. Simon's Rock has shown how America's educational lockstep can be broken, but it is up to American educators at every level to make that a reality.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See Hutchins, R.M., **The Higher Learning in America** (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936).

[2] Hall, Elizabeth B., 'The House of Education Needs Overhaul,' National Association of Independent Schools, 1967).

[3] Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

[4] New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

[5] Nancy Goldberger. **Breaking the Educational Lockstep: The Simon's Rock Experience** (Great Barrington: Simon's Rock Early College, 1977).

[6] Perry, W.G., Jr., **Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme** (New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1970).

[7] Loevinger, J., **Ego Development** (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976).

[8] Kohlberg, L. and Gilligan, C., 'The Adolescent as a Philosopher: The Discovery of the Self in a Post-Conventional World; in **Daedelus**, Fall, 1971.

[9] ***Op. cit.***

[10] ***Ibid.***, p. 13.

[11] ***Ibid.***

[12] ***Ibid.***, p. 14.

[13] ***Ibid.***, pp. 24f.

93

THE CONTRIBUTORS

FREDERICK P. FERRÉ. Charles A. Dana Professor of Philosophy, Dickinson College: member of the Board of Trustees, Simon's Rock Early College; author of several books including **Shaping the Future.**

NANCY R. GOLDBERGER. Director of Evaluation at Simon's Rock Early College.

ELIZABETH B. HALL. Founder and President Emerita of Simon's Rock Early College; former Headmistress of Concord Academy; author of **The House of Education Needs Overhaul** and other essays on education.

PAUL E. KAYLOR (editor). Director of the Development of Institutional Resources at Simon's Rock Early College.

JOSEPH KATZ. Professor of Human Development and Director of Research for Human Development and Educational Policy University of New York at Stony Brook; author of several books, including **No Time for Youth.**

SAMUEL H. MAGILL. President of Simon's Rock Early College; author of essays on education, including **The Aims of Liberal Education in the Post Modern World.**

EDWARD JOSEPH SHOBEN, JR. Former president of Pacific Oaks College; author of **Students, Stress, and the College Experience** and other essays on education.

EDWARD A. WYNNE. Associate Professor of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, author of several books and articles including **Suburban Youth: Children and Adolescents in Post-Industrial Environments.**